

## ➤HEBRAICA.◀

---

VOL. VII.

JULY, 1891.

---

NO. 4.

### TWO NESTORIAN RITUAL PRAYERS.

BY ISAAC H. HALL,

Metropolitan Museum, New York City.

---

In the same manuscript from which I furnished *HEBRAICA* with the text of "The Story of Arsânîs" and of "The Narrative of Moses Elect in Prophecy," are two prayers of some interest. An English translation of both is given in Badger's "Nestorians and their Rituals," Vol. II., pp. 280, 281. But his texts must have differed somewhat from those which I have.

The first prayer is the "Prayer said over the Bride when she enters the church forty days after marriage," and the other the "Prayer said over a child and its mother when it enters the church forty days after delivery." Whatever analogy there may be found in Western customs to the first, the second answers to the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal "Churching of Women."

Of the first I have two texts; one in a manuscript comprising the entire Marriage Service of the Nestorians, which I received from Urmî (Oroomia) last year; and this I take as the text to present here, giving in notes the material variants of the text in my other manuscript first above mentioned. My reason for this choice is (chiefly), that in the marriage service this prayer seems to be used of the bride alone, the ceremony being *her* purification, a thing of which the bridegroom, according to many prevalent notions, and the different constitution and functions of the sexes, should stand in no need. But in the first above-mentioned manuscript, the scribe has added words here and there, and placed points ungrammatically, and changed inflexional and suffix terminations (sometimes, apparently, by mistake), so as to give a text which could be read over *either* bridegroom or bride—and that notwithstanding the fact that some of it (at least according to Oriental notions) is wholly inappropriate to the bridegroom.







עֲדָהָהּ וְעַד־מִנָּהּ כִּי יִלְדָּהּ בְּאֵחָס עַם הָאֱלֹהִים וְזָכְרָהּ בְּבֵיתֶךָ עַד־

מִנְחָתָהּ \*

עַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

כִּי אֵלֶיךָ מִבְּרִיתָהּ. וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ וְעַד־כִּי יִשְׁלַחְךָ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֶדְתָּהּ

בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים \*

#### TRANSLATION.

The Blessing that is said over a Child and his Mother forty days after her giving birth.

Lord God Almighty, Creator of the heaven and the earth and all that in them is, who didst make [it] a law to the fathers of old, and didst command that every one both male and female at forty days old should come to thy holy house and give an offering to the priest, that he should pray over it, and it should be purified; thou, Lord, didst fulfill this command in the coming of thy beloved Son to the temple when he was forty days old, when Simeon the aged received him in his arms, and confessed, and asked of him dismissal from his life. And now also, Lord God, bless and sanctify this child (naming it), and his mother, that [it, the child] has come to the holy church, which is the house, the abode of righteousness, that he may ask of thee that thou wouldst grant to her<sup>29</sup> that milk may abound to his nurse, and that he may be kept from evil<sup>30</sup> and the powers thereof, and may increase in holiness and in the true faith all the days of his life. Amen.

<sup>28</sup> Most likely a mistake for **לָהּ**. The style of the composition requires it, and the text of Badger's translation must have had that reading.

<sup>29</sup> Doubtless the correct reading is "to him." See corresponding note to the Syriac text.

<sup>30</sup> Or possibly, "from the evil one and his powers." But it is not true that the masculine adjective points to a person in Syriac. It is used in the Peshitto, and elsewhere, for the Greek masculine, feminine and neuter, and is the regular word and form for abstract evil.



## THE ORDER OF THE SENTENCE IN THE HEBREW PORTIONS OF DANIEL.

JAMES H. BREASTED,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

It has been stated by conservative critics and largely admitted by some more liberal, that the Hebrew of Daniel offers too scanty material from which to draw any conclusions as to the date of its composition. Without here affirming the contrary, it is the object of this paper to present some data in view of which it would seem necessary to modify the above statement. It is well established that such a thing as a historical development in Hebrew syntax is a fact, and investigations in the cognate tongues have shown and are showing every day the marked changes in syntactical structure, which in them also were wrought either by natural decay or the difference in environment as the centuries passed. The greatest drawback to such investigation in Hebrew is the meagreness of the material. While the other Semitic tongues, in general, present such a wealth of literature that the various phases of the development can be traced with tolerable accuracy, such is not the case with the Hebrew writings. And even of those which we have, the date of the majority is very uncertain. Under these circumstances the formulation of any theory of syntactical development is much hampered; first by the lack of material, and second, by the vast periods which intervene between the disputed dates of many of the most extensive products of the literature, so that any theory at all is almost an impossibility till the dates of the books are established with some degree of certainty. Notwithstanding these difficulties which beset the case as a whole, it would seem that in the matter of individual composition certain definite results *can* be obtained, which offer ground for a legitimate induction. It is with this end in view that an examination of some phases of the syntax of the Hebrew of Daniel has been made, rather than for the mere syntax itself, and as data for comparison were also indispensable we shall be nearly as much concerned with some other books as with Daniel.

There is no more definite rule in Hebrew than that which governs the order of the sentence as far as its two chief members are concerned. Indeed we may go further and say that the definite order, predicate-subject, is according to a fundamental principle of the language, which regards the idea contained in the verbal form, as the most important, and hence to be presented first. The subject is entirely secondary and being already implied and contained in the verbal form, therefore follows. Any violation of this principle is for a legitimate



reason; the expression of an adventitious circumstance, emphasis, contrast, chiasm, etc. When both predicate and subject are nouns the opposite order prevails, because not an *action* but a continuous and permanent *condition* is expressed, which demands the same order as in a circumstantial clause. The exception in the case of the predicate adjective is, that it may not be mistaken for an attributive. The above principles being inviolable, save in respect of the exceptions cited, any violations not in accordance with these exceptions may be regarded as abnormal, and if habitual would point to a time when loose usage and laxness prevailed. Hence an examination into the order of subject and predicate seemed to the writer the division of the syntax which would offer the most conclusive results, and it is rather a presentation of results which is here designed than any detailed discussion of them.

Even the most superficial reading of Daniel reveals a looseness and freedom of syntactical structure which is in strange contrast with the earlier simplicity. The writer does not seem at home in the language, and his style is radically different from that which preceded his alleged exilic date. He never rises to a conscious control and complete grasp of the language, such as marks the strong periods of the second Isaiah. Its elements seem cumbrous and clumsy in his hands; the monotonous recurrence of the same construction in successive clauses naturally vitiates any vividness which would result from a choice of expressive words, for in his vocabulary the writer is forcible and strong. But a closer and more systematic examination into the structure of his sentences substantiates the first impression. A strange liberty prevails, and there is entire indifference to some of the fundamental principles of syntax. For example, in the ordinary declarative sentence it seems to make but little difference to the writer whether the subject or predicate precedes, *e. g.*, 8:8a, וַיִּפֹּר הָעֵינִים הַגְּדִיל וְגו. \* There is no reasonable ground here for the precedence of the subject. The clause cannot be circumstantial; it is not an emphatic or chiastic arrangement and we can only say that the writer had little or no constraint upon him in the arrangement of his sentence. But to what extent does this looseness of structure prevail? A tabulation of all the declarative sentences reveals that 32½ per cent. of these are of this abnormal order. This classification *excludes all* clauses which could reasonably be called circumstantial or inverted for emphasis, etc. In doubtful cases, the benefit of the doubt was accorded, and such clauses were excluded. What reason can be assigned for this writer's abnormally frequent use of the compound nominal sentence? Including *all* such clauses their occurrence would be at least 35 per cent. of all declarative sentences, and it would be absurd to declare that they are all circumstantial, emphatic, etc. Such an explanation is impossible

\* If the reader wishes to note other examples which come under no law, see 8:1; 8:2; 8:5; 8:8; 8:12; 8:22; 8:27. Their frequency in this chapter may afford some idea of the looseness which prevails, and show how lax is the style.



on the face of it, and an examination of such individual clauses as the above demonstrates that it is not the case. We must then accept the fact that this writer sets at utter defiance the law above stated and writes in entire disregard of it. But this fact does not stand alone. We find the same peculiarity is characteristic of the simple nominal sentence, or rather its opposite is true. The continuance of any state or condition, since it implies the prominence of the *subject*, demands as above stated, the precedence of the same. This is a fundamental law; but is not so regarded by the writer of Daniel; e. g., 8:17b, : *בִּי לַעֲת־קֵץ הַחֹזֶן*.\* This order prevails in 28½ per cent. of the simple nominal clauses. Of course it is necessary in this class to exclude all cases in which the predicate is an adjective, for the precedence of the predicate adjective is so prevalent as to be almost regular. The explanation of this abnormal order in the simple nominal sentence is not far away. The precedence of the subject as already often stated is ordinarily of marked significance, if the predicate be a verb. Now, as we have noted, there occur in Daniel numerous cases of the compound nominal sentence, in which there is *no* significance. That is, this inverted order no longer means anything to this writer. Hence it is no longer necessary or essentially natural for him to place the subject first in the simple nominal sentence, for the idea of continuance of condition implied by the precedence of the subject is gone. This may explain the paucity of circumstantial clauses in Daniel according to our classification, to which some objection might be offered; but many compound nominal sentences which we have counted as circumstantial have been translated as principal clauses by the revisers. I have not counted the number of such clauses which the revisers have rendered as circumstantial, but they would be very few indeed, and I believe this is largely true of the rest of the Old Testament also.

Now the explanation of this usage is by no means easy. That a difference from ordinary usage, so marked, could have arisen at once we cannot believe. The development is too broad and deep-seated, it goes down into the fundamentals of the language. Is it the result of a long process of syntactical decay just as the gradual dissolution of the organic forms in the language had taken place centuries before? Or shall we call it a development into greater freedom and larger liberty of use rather than a dissolution, and say that the early limitation which confined the chief members of a principal clause to one stereotyped order was narrow; that the language is now breaking away from the primitive fetters which hampered and clogged its action, and attaining a broader scope, just as in later times its vocabulary grew to meet the larger range of thought? Be the change one of development or decay, we are inclined to attribute it to outside influences, for the same phenomenon is observable in the Aramaic of the book.

---

\* Other examples of the same order will be found in 8:17,19; 9:23,26,27; 10:1, etc. It is true that a predicate consisting of a prepositional phrase is inclined to precede, but we have in Hebrew no rigid rule for this case as in Arabic.



Driver\* remarks, "A tendency may often be observed in the Chaldee portions of Daniel and Ezra to throw the verb to the end." Indeed we may go further and say that it is *more* than a "tendency," for it is extremely prevalent in the declarative sentence, and with the imperative the precedence of the *object* is so frequent as to be almost regular. With the infinitive it is also very marked. The tendency in the Aramaic is therefore much stronger than in the Hebrew where it is largely confined to the declarative sentence, there being *no* instance of an object preceding an imperative and with extreme rarity, one preceding an infinitive. This phenomenon in both languages cannot but forcibly remind us of the Assyrian in which the subsequence of the verb is regular. Especially is this true of the Aramaic infinitive following its object, which is a rigidly regular order in Assyrian, whenever the infinitive is not a substantive in construct with a following genitive but is treated as a finite verb. (Cf. DG. p. 339) e. g. (Esarh. A. I 48,49) danân Ašûr...kullumimma to show forth the might of Ashur; also (Tig.-Pil. I 49) mišir mâtišunu ruppūša iḳbi'uni, to increase the territory of their country they commanded me. The resemblance to such Aramaic phrases as the following is quite remarkable לֹא אָתִי אָנֹשׁ עַל-יְבִשְׁתָּא דִּי מַלְתָּ מֶלֶכָא יוֹכַל לְהַחְיָה וְגוֹ. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the language of a nation whose conquests were so vast and so long continued, and which so impressed the nations round it with the genius of its progressive spirit, must have strongly affected and to some extent warped the kindred tongues with which it came in contact? And though it finally succumbed to the resistless encroachments of the Aramaic, it was probably in many respects a Pyrrhus victory for the latter. If then the Aramaic exhibits the influence of the Assyrian why not also the Hebrew, though perhaps more largely at second-hand through the Aramaic? Prof. William R. Harper would explain some of the puzzling imperfects of the II Isaiah as due to the Babylonian influence;† and the grounds for such a conclusion are very strong.

Before passing to the comparison of Daniel with other books, we note some further facts of less importance concerning it. As a general observation it may be said that the order of words follows the looser rules with much more regularity than those more rigid. As an example of the close observance of a less stringent rule, we may notice the position of the indirect object when it is a pronoun, in which case it usually follows the predicate and precedes the direct object. This, though not an inviolable rule, is well observed in Daniel, cf. 1:7 and 17. Even when it is a noun, the indirect has a strong tendency to precede the direct object. In view of the frequency of entirely abnormal orders in Daniel, it is strange that so few arrangements for emphasis exist. Ewald (quoted by Driver, *Heb. Tenses*,

\* *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 306.

† Cf. article "Some of the Imperfects in the Deutero-Isaiah" in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1891.



pp. 305-6) notes the following variations for emphasis, viz.: *Object, predicate, subject*, which puts the emphasis on the subject. This order occurs once in Daniel, 9:26. (2) *Object, subject, predicate*, a very rare arrangement which does not occur at all in Daniel. It is regular for the participle, but there is no case of it to be found in Daniel, though the participial construction is very common as is usual with late Hebrew. (3) *Subject, object, predicate*. This is not found in Daniel. It makes prominent the subject and is a common enough arrangement. (4) *Predicate, object, subject*. This order, which emphasizes the subject, is found in 10:18, but this single occurrence may be explained by the fact that the object is a pronoun, and being after וְהָיָה and construed with כִּי, the writer regards it as practically equivalent to an indirect object and hence regularly places it after the predicate, as we have seen he is in the habit of doing. It is thus very evident that the writer does not avail himself of those strikingly emphatic arrangements which are so great an advantage to the style of the earlier prophets, especially Isaiah. In the case of the relative clause the chief fact of interest is that in all clauses where the relative pronoun is the direct object of the verb, there is no instance where the pronoun also occurs as the real object. This would indicate a time when אֲשֶׁר had entirely passed over from being merely a relative *particle* or *nota relationis*, into the true functions of a relative *pronoun*.

Passing now to the comparison of Daniel with other books, we take up Ecclesiastes. It is needless to argue here for the late date of this book. As the writer in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* remarks, that on the continent, if one were to set about proving that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes, it would be equivalent to adducing evidence toward a demonstration that the world does not stand still. Assuming its late date therefore, this book may serve to show us the state of the syntax in later Hebrew as evidenced by the order of words. By an examination of all clauses consisting of subject and finite verb we find that 35½ per cent. of these are of the order subject-predicate, and this, after giving the benefit of the doubt to all possible circumstantial clauses or arrangements for emphasis, etc. This is not far from the 32½ per cent. of such inverted order in Daniel. In the case of the simple nominal sentence in Ecclesiastes, the occurrence of the abnormal order predicate-subject is 20⅞ per cent. This is again to be compared with the 28½ per cent. of a like arrangement in Daniel. Are these books very far apart in time? or is an inference that they are not, to be met by the objection, that such a looseness might have prevailed over a century-long period, and that thus, books which are hundreds of years apart may exhibit the same peculiarities? This is a valid objection and a comparison as limited as the above is not conclusive. The length of time during which such syntactical anarchy prevailed must be further defined and limited as to the *terminus a quo*. A tabulation of the declarative sentence in the Hebrew of Ezra was therefore made with the following results: Comp. nominal clause, not circumstantial, nor arranged for emphasis,



etc., 28 $\frac{7}{10}$  per cent.; simple nominal clause, order pred.-subj. 18 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. Assuming some period subsequent to the time of Nehemiah as the date of this book it will be noted that an author writing at this time, is a degree less loose and irregular than the writer of Ecclesiastes at the time of the Maccabees(?), or Daniel writing, as alleged, in the time of the captivity. Passing on to an earlier time and examining Malachi (former half of the fifth century?) we find these results: Comp. nominal clause not circumstantial, nor arranged for emphasis, etc., 15 per cent.; simple nominal clause order pred.-subj., 19 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. That is, the inversion of the finite verb with its subject is less than *one-half* as frequent as in Daniel. But an examination of an exilic author practically contemporaneous with the alleged date of Daniel ought to furnish results not less interesting than those obtained from Ecclesiastes. For this purpose the prophecy of Ezekiel was used. Time did not permit the writer to tabulate more than ten chapters, but it is thought that these are sufficient for the basis of a fair induction. The declarative sentence in this material more nearly approaches harmony with the principles which were laid down at the outset. These are the results: Comp. nominal clause, not circumstantial, nor arranged for emphasis, etc., .08 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. simple nominal clause order pred.-subj., 13 per cent. That is, the two abnormal orders are respectively about one-fourth and less than one-half as frequent as in Daniel. We can here trace a development, beginning with Ezekiel, some phases of which are quite definite and which it may be well to note. It is noticeable in the earlier literature that two clauses with verbal predicate following the subject in *both*, are found together, their juxtaposition being explained by desire for contrast between the two subjects. In Arabic where this order occurs, if the clause is not circumstantial, a contrast with another subject is *always* implied. Cf. Quran, II. 221, *أُولَٰئِكَ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى النَّارِ وَاللَّهُ يَدْعُو إِلَى الْجَنَّةِ*.... "These invite to the fire, but God invites to Paradise....;" see also II. 271. This is an invariable and rigid rule in Arabic and also in *earlier* Hebrew, which shows very plainly what was the normal rule. The occurrence of such contrasted clauses is very frequent in Ezekiel, and of this the seventh chapter presents a striking example. It contains no less than fourteen such emphatic inversions, i. e. seven pairs, for example v. 23: *כִּי-הָאָרֶץ מְלֹאָה מִשְׁפָּט דָּמִים וְהָעִיר מְלֹאָה חָמָס*: This method of revelling in antithesis seems to be a favorite one with this prophet. But at this time, *emphatic contrast* in thus placing two inverted clauses together is not the invariable significance, for the same device came to be employed in presenting two parallel propositions, especially in the case of comparison. This was sharply to call attention to the two subjects as possessing something common in the respective actions or qualities predicated of them both. Cf. Job 5:7 *כִּי אָדָם לְעֵמֶל יוֹלֵד וּבְנֵי רֶשֶׁף יִגְבִּיהוּ עוֹף*: This usage may perhaps explain the later degeneration, for the comparison is not so strongly emphatic as the contrasted



clauses like the example from Ezekiel. In Malachi's three chapters there are four such couplets, yet not entirely *such* as those in Ezekiel. The first (1:4) presents two *strongly* contrasted subjects, but in the second (1:5) the contrast is doubtful. It is rather the presentation of two co-ordinate facts and not for comparison either. The third (2:6) again presents a strong contrast, while the fourth (3:6) seems to offer a new example in which beside the contrast expressed, the first clause presents the *reason* for the second. Ezra contains but *one* example of this usage, i. e., 9:6: **כִּי עֲוֹנֵינוּ רַבּוֹ לְמַעַלְהָ רֹאשׁ וְאַשְׁמָתֵנוּ גְדֹלָה עַד לַיְשָׁמִים**; . Here we have two co-ordinate and practically synonymous clauses. There is no contrast here as in the earlier language. But it is in Ecclesiastes that we find this usage reaching its climax; the inverted couplets are very common, sometimes presenting strong contrasts and again the two facts being merely co-ordinate, and seeming to be thus inverted and placed together from the analogy presented in the case of the comparison. For as in the comparison, the two similar facts are graphically put together by bringing into prominence the two subjects, so here the two co-ordinate and perhaps identical truths are presented in the same way, though there is no comparison and not necessarily the slightest emphasis. As an example of emphatic contrast cf. Eccl. 7:26b: **טוֹב לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים יִמְלֹט מִמָּוֶה**; and on the other hand for the juxtaposition of two simply co-ordinate statements, without any emphasis because of the inverted order, cf. 10:9: **מִסֵּעַ אֲבָנִים יַעֲצֵב בָּהֶם בּוֹקֵעַ עֵצִים יִסְכֵּן בָּם**. There has plainly been then a degeneration in the usage and significance of two such inverted contiguous clauses, contrasting very strongly with the earlier rigid use, which was without doubt the original, as presented in the Arabic. In the case of Daniel we find the decay complete. In 11:41 there is possibly an example of this usage, but more probably the latter of the two inverted clauses, is circumstantial. One other only is to be found, 11:26 **וְאֶכְלִי פִתְּבָנוּ יִשְׁכְּרוּהוּ וְחִילוֹ יִשְׁטֹף וְגו'**. There is not the slightest emphasis on either of these clauses; the writer seems not to appreciate the force which such an arrangement should imply. Its elder usage is far below the horizon of his knowledge, and the precedence of the subject has little significance to his mind.

Another method of emphasis in the earlier language was the expression of the pronoun as subject, though already implied in the verbal form. If the clause stood alone, unless very strong emphasis was desired, the pronominal subject followed the verb, but if it stood joined to another clause with which contrast was desired *both* subjects preceded, as we have noted was customary in the case just considered. There is a fine example of this in Mal. 1:4, **הִמָּה יִבְנוּ וְאֲנִי אֶהְרֹס**. But as the language developed from its earlier simplicity into a style less severe and more full, the pronoun came to be used in cases where no special emphasis was desired or expressed. This usage finds its greatest development in Ecclesiastes, but it is to be noted that at this period this unemphatic pronoun *always*

follows the verb, e. g., Eccl. 2:1, אִמְרָתִי אֲנִי בִלְבִי וְגו', otherwise some emphasis is implied. But in Daniel, not only does the superfluous pronoun frequently occur, but in quite a number of cases it *precedes the verb*. Not less than nine such are to be found, (two of which are periphrastic), e. g., 9:23, בְּתַחֲלֵת תַּחֲנוּנַיִךְ יֵצֵא דְבַר וְאֲנִי בָאתִי לְהוֹדִיר. Another example of the same phrase is to be found in 10:12. This construction also occurs in Ezra in six instances and not being found at all in Ecclesiastes, the fact would favor the position of the latter before Ezra, which is given it by Ewald. There is one case in Ecclesiastes where the pronoun does precede, viz., 1:12, אֲנִי קִהַלְתִּי הָיִיתִי וְגו' but this is probably designed to make prominent the subject. A similar arrangement is found once in Daniel, 8:27 וְאֲנִי דָנִיל נְהִיִּיתִי וְגו' possibly with the same object.

It is to be noted that the order of words in participial clauses is more regular in the earlier books. The percentage of inverted order, that is predicate-subject, is as follows: Ezekiel, .13 $\frac{1}{6}$ ; Malachi, .10; Ezra, .16 $\frac{2}{3}$ ; Ecclesiastes, .18 $\frac{7}{10}$ ; Daniel, .19.

These clauses have already been included of course under simple nominal sentences. In connection with the participle it is interesting to note that in the material examined the periphrastic construction occurs only in Ezra and Daniel; once in the former, five times in the latter. Of these five in Daniel, the inverted order subject-predicate is found in three.

In conclusion, the material classified presents the following order when arranged according to percentage of irregularity, comprising *all* inversions in the declarative sentence: Ezekiel, .10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ; Malachi, .16 $\frac{2}{3}$ ; Ezra, .25; Ecclesiastes, .27 $\frac{1}{2}$ ; Daniel, .30 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

It is not claimed for a moment that this arrangement is definitely chronological, but the great gulf between Ezekiel and Daniel is very significant, and it seems to be true that the intervening books bridge it quite satisfactorily. Neither is this development without parallel; we are presented with an exactly similar phenomenon in the order of the Assyrian sentence. The historical inscriptions show a development, from the rigid observance of the rule for the subsequence of the verb in the time of Tiglath Pileser I. to a freedom so great in the time of Ašurbanipal, that the opposite order predominates.\* That is, a much more extensive change has taken place in the Assyrian than is claimed for the Hebrew during practically the same length of time. In view of this analogy, we cannot but think that the facts presented are some additional indication of the late date of Daniel. They may not be conclusive alone, but in connection with the many other considerations which point the same way, they seem very significant. It seems reasonable to the writer that such an examination of the hexateuchal documents might furnish some interesting indications as well as in other fields and it is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when the historical development of Hebrew syntax shall have been definitely determined and arranged.

\* This fact is obtained from investigations made by Dr. Lester Bradner, Jr., of Yale University, which will appear in the next number of *HEBRAICA*.



## ASSYRIAN ETYMOLOGIES.

BY REV. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, PH. D.,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

### II. A-ṭap-pu = ṭap-pu = Hebrew טַפַּח, *coping*.

According to *KB*. II. 136-7, Esarhaddon used for his buildings (iḡu) gušûrî rabûti (iḡu) dim-me ġîrûti (iḡu) a-ṭap-pi (iḡu) erinu (iḡu) šur-man<sup>1</sup> (I R. 47, 14a) translated by Abel *large beams, high posts, door-posts of cedar- and cypress-wood*.

Harper, *AEI*. p. 14, reads here and Col. VI. 2, a-bi-me, with Norris, *Dictionary*, I. 40, while Strassmaier's reading a-ṭap-pi (*AV*. 2359) is followed by Abel and others. In favor of this reading, it may be stated that the signs tap and pi can very easily run together so closely as to form the signs bi (kas) and me (šip).

Winckler, *Sargon-texte*, pp. 72, 426; 92, 75; 136, 164 (= *KB*. II. 76); 140, 36 and 154, 116, we find promiscuously the reading (iḡ) tap-pi and (iḡ) dap-pi, in the glossary only .tap-pu = *door-post*.

I read throughout (iḡ) ṭap-pi and connect with it the (iḡ) a-ṭap-pi of Esarh. v. 15 and VI. 2. Ṭappu, or with prosthetic *a* a-ṭap-pu, stands for ṭap'u and this for ṭaphu and is equivalent to the Hebrew טַפַּח (from טַפַּח = Arabic طَفَح)<sup>2</sup> which in architecture is "the coping" (II Kgs. VII. 9),<sup>3</sup> or the pinnacle-like fence of flat roofs, a roof enclosure, or corbel; this meaning suits the context very well, e. g., Col. VI. 2, the aṭappi, being the copings of the dimme ġîrûti, are of cedar- and cypress-wood, and are placed upon them as the ku-lul ba-be-ši-in, to complete, or round off the doors. The passages quoted from the *Sargon-texte* conclusively show that a-ṭap-pi is the same as ṭap-pi, for they read, without exception, (iḡ) ṭap-pi kulul babešin emid,

<sup>1</sup> šurman is the constr. of šur-man-nu; it is a genuine Semitic word, being derived from the verb šaramu, and a form like allānu, etc.; šurmēnu, šur'inu, etc., are byforms.

<sup>2</sup> ṭe-pu-u is mentioned in II R. 39, 63 as a synonym of šalû (שָׁלוּ) and na-pa-gu (*to jump*); also see 49, 64; Strassmaier, *Nabonidus*, 499, l. 18, we read hu-uḡ-ḡu ša itti bîti kâri ṭi-pu-u = *the shed which is in connexion with the garret*. (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. IV, 117 sq.; Tallquist, *Die Sprache des Contracte Nabû-nâ'idis*, pp. 74 and 76, translates bîṭ huḡḡu by "the addition" (Anbau) and ṭepû by "to spread out.")

<sup>3</sup> All these (great buildings) were of costly stones according to the measures of hewed stones sawed with saws, within and without, even from the foundation unto the coping, and so on the outside toward the great court.

just as Esarh. VI. 2, the only difference being aṭappi in the one and ṭappi in the other cases.<sup>4</sup>

### III. antalû eclipse.

antalû and attalû have usually been considered Akkadian loan words, anta = eliš and lu = katamu to cover, make obscure (cf. KGF. 341, rem. 1; ZK. I. 259-261; AV. 919; ZB. 6, rem. 1; also see Jensen's *Kosmologie*, p. 32). It is, however, a Semitic noun derived from natalu, in the meaning of ἐκλείπειν. III R. 58 (No. 8) 50 we read a-ta-lu-u (var. to AN-MI) ušetaq; II R. 48, 29 cd we read at-ta-lu-u and *ibid.*, 30-31 an-ta-lu (for lu see HT. 119, 12 and 126, 25; ZK. I. 259) = a-da-ru ša Sin and ūmu da'mu (𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵) a dark day; also III R. 70, 50, where u-tu-lu is followed by an-ta-lu = a-da-ru ša Sin and lu = katamu (𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵) and dalaḥu (𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵, II R. 48, 45 cd) whence the Akkadian etymology of antalû; attalû is an eclipse of the moon (according to Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 32, a total eclipse), while ḡalulu is a solar eclipse; cf. Asrn. I. 44, Senn. I. 6 and II R. 48, 5; 49, 42.

The fact that the Akkadian may have a similar expression for the same phenomenon, cannot militate against a Semitic derivation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> II R. 21, 14b we read ku-lu [lu] preceded by ka-[li]-lum and according to Del. *ProL* 174, rem. 1 = hi-it-ti bābani encasements of the doors (V R. 10, 102); the same word occurs in V R. 28, 93cd as a synonym of napsamu bit, rein (cf. V R. 47, 40b = maḡgaru ša pī sisē) and also on several contract tablets of Cyrus; Tallquist's reading ḡubātu lu-lu = 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵 (Contracte Nabûnâ'id's, p. 88) has to be corrected to ku-lu-lu according to BAS. I. 635 ad p. 526. V R. 28, 17 we find ḡubat ku-lu-li. To the same stem 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵 belongs kililu the setting (of a gem); a garland, wreath, Neb. III. 68; ix. 17. Pognon, Wadi-Brissa, 76, rem. 1, compares Arabic اكلیل; Del. Gram. § 63; kililiš like a wreath, Esarh. VI. 5; Harper, *AEI*. Speaking of Delitzsch's Grammar, I should like to point out some errors made by the translator, Prof. Kennedy. § 65, 35 adannu is translated: tent (= Zelt), but correct it to time (= Zeit); § 39 Šiptu is incantation (Beschwörung) not conspiracy (Verschwörung); i-qi-pa-an-ni (Neb. I. 42) is = he ordered me (er gab mir auf) not he gave me up (er gab mich auf), as we find on p. 137, addenda; also see p. 296 ad IV R. 65, 4 and several other passages.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e. g. šangû priest = Akkadian sanga, from the Semitic verb nagû: 𐎶𐎵 to be bright, pure, thus originally = purifier, enlightener, cf. 𐎶𐎵 Psalm XVIII. 29 (BAS. I. 160, rem. 2); while BOR. III. 120 explains it as "one bound by a vow"; Sb. 148 nanga from nagû district; just as balanga from balaku; ša-ki-ir-ru a drinking-vessel, from šakaru (𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵) Akkadian šakir II R. 22, 28 de; HT. 11, 81; illatu power, force, Akkadian el-lat from alalu to be strong; also see BAS. I. 168, 11. In all these cases Akkadian has undoubtedly borrowed from the Assyrian, i. e. the Assyrian scribes, compiling syllabaries, etc., disfigured and mutilated Assyrian words so as to make them appear like Akkadian; to this category belongs a number of readings in SA., Sb. and SC., e. g. Sb. I. 2 and 4; 49, 68, 73, 79 and 80, 89, 116, 118, 123 sa-xar = ep-ru; 130, 132, 134, 139, 141, 146 u-sar = še-it-tum from eseru; 157, 158 si-gi-še = ni-qu-u from šaqašu to slaughter; 169 and 170; 173-181; 186; 190 u-nu = šub-tu (cf. ūnu and ūnûtu); 193 (cf. ZA. IV. 63, No. 21), 212 (cf. HEBRAICA, VII., 89, rem. 17), 215 and 216, 225, 235, 237, 241-3; 247-8; 257, 260, 261, 269, 278, 280, 282, 290-1, 296, 302, 304, 307, 311; 313 ka-ra from ka-ra-ru to surround; 349; 354sq., 378 and many others. It is also strange that the name of the moon-god Sin should be derived from the Akkadian zu-en = enzu Lord of wisdom = bēl nēmēqi, which latter is the title of Ea, not of Sin. Si-in occurs IV R. 68, 9b; ZK. I. 271; ZA. I. 227, note g. Could this be the later Assyrian form of the earlier AN Ši-nu-um, read by M. Jules Oppert on a tablet in 1855 (see GGA. '78, 1032) and derived from 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵 to change?



#### IV. Tamkaru and Timkallu.

Dam-ka-ru, *servant, field laborer*, is usually derived from the Akkadian DAM-KAR; Ht. 35, 838, Del. *Lesest.*<sup>3</sup> 22, 182; DAM being explained as an Akkadian prefix having the force of the Arabic Zaid and KAR = ab-bu-ut-tu (Ht. 60, Col. IV. 4, 24, 501) *fetter* (?); Haupt, *SFG.* 35-6; etc.<sup>6</sup> The variant tam-ka-ru,<sup>7</sup> occurring in several passages, shows that the 𐎶 is due to partial assimilation of 𐎶 to the following 𐎶; thus read tamkaru and derive it from makaru to *buy* and to *sell* (Hebr. מכר to *sell*); the tam-ka-ru was properly "the bought slave."<sup>8</sup>

Another word of Semitic origin is timkallu or timkallû *architect, artist*; Senn. VI. 45 ekallu ša elî mahṛîti ma'diṣ šûturat rabâta u naklat ina šipir (ameluti) tim-kal-li-e enquti ana mûṣab belû-tiia uṣepiṣ; this passage supports my etymology from nakalu נכל to be skillful; timkallu stands for tinkallu and is a form like tiḡmaru, tisqaru, etc.

#### V. ŠE-BAR and ŠE-ZIR.

Are usually considered Akkadian ideograms. This would imply that ŠE itself is an ideogram. Granting this, it does not follow by any means that the expressions are of Akkadian origin as is usually supposed. Šeum is to be connected with שׁעׁע to which belongs Mishnic שְׁעוּעִית (J. Halévy, *ZA.* IV. 58); the Meš in še-im-Meš Tig. Pil. VI. 103 merely indicates the quantity; in II R. 44, 66 ab we find the feminine form še-a-tum = Še-Bar, *corn*; and Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 372, reads Del. *Lesest.* p. 101, Frg. b, l. 7, šeātka for Še-BAR-ka. The ideogram ŠE = še-um *corn* (e. g. Ht. 26, 556) is the abbreviated construct state of the Assyrian še-um, while *ibid.* No. 557 še = magari is abbreviated from šemû, to *hear, listen*, a synonym of magari. Še-BAR is a compound of this še + BAR from barû<sup>9</sup> to *become full, satisfied, to eat*, a synonym of li-e-mu (לחם) and še-bu-u (II R. 24, 53 ab, sqq.). Še-BAR could there-

<sup>6</sup> II R. 31, 72 we have an officer of "tam-qar" perhaps = *overseer of the slaves*; II R. 7, 84; V R. 39, 38-39 gh we read i-bi-ra = dam-ka-ru and dam-qar = damkaru, preceded by ma-ag-ri-tu on which see Zb. 43, rem. 2; BAS. I. 14, rem. 6; Jensen, *Kosmol.* 123, rem. 1, and ZDMG. 43, 193. On i-bi-ra see HEBRAICA, VII., 82, rem. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Ht. 69, 8 AZAG DAM-GAR-RA = ka-sap tam-ka-ri.

<sup>8</sup> V R. 16, 22 gh has nothing to do with tamkaru; we read here SAP-GAL = dam-ga-ru (for tam-ga-ru) *tub, barrel*, a synonym of naṣpaku II R. 22, 19 d; BAS. I. 177 and 635 SAP is from the Semitic ṣap-pu Sb. 218 = a *jug* from a root שפף according to BAS. I. 533; while Tallquist, p. 112, reads sappu = Hebrew שפף.

<sup>9</sup> From the same barû I derive ta-bar-ru in such expressions as ḡbât ta-bar-ra, etc., literally = *gesüttigt* (i. e. dyed, said of wools and clothings). V R. 61, 47 e we read ḡbat ta-bar-ru followed by ḡbat takiltu (תכלת); this takiltu violet purple is, by no means, to be confounded with takiltu = *omen*, as Winckler does in KB. II. 142-3 ad Col. I. 8. Could Greek σῖρος, pl. σῖρα, *corn*, which has no Indo-germanic etymon, have any connexion with this še-um, še-a-tum?

fore be = šeum ana bâri *corn for food = cereals*; še-BAR being equivalent to še-a-tum; ŠE-BAR-su can be read še-at-su, but še-BAR-šu is to be read še-bar-šu. Like še-BAR I explain še-ZIR as a compound of še + zir from zêru *seed*; thus = *corn for seeding purposes*. Nabonidus, 445, ŠE-BAR ana ŠE-ZIR would be corn which was to be used for food is now used for seeding purposes. Zehnpfund, *BAS.* I. 515, still considers both expressions as Akkadian ideograms.\*

---

\* The next number of *HEBRAICA* will contain etymologies, among others, of šûtu, *southwind*, pagîtu and pagûtu, ta-a-an the complement after cardinal numerals and GAB-RI = mahîru.



## A PHOENICIAN SEAL.

BY MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

The material of this seal\* is a dark agate of quite ordinary quality, interspersed with streaks and spots of bright jasper on the under side. In contradistinction to the ordinary character of the material, which, with cornelian, is the most common substance of Phoenician seals, the design and inscription on it are unusually interesting and so far as can be ascertained unique.

The stone is pierced at the oblong ends, no doubt for being set in a circular clasp, such as is figured in Perrot and Chipiez's *History of Art in Phoenicia*, I., p. 241. This clasp was in turn surmounted by a ring through which the cord was passed that, permitted the seal to be worn around the neck.† The shape of the seal with its convex surface and flat bottom recalls the Egyptian scarab while the fact that, as is the case with so many of the Phoenician seals, nothing more than the *general* outlines of the beetle have been copied with no attempt at detail, also proves that for the artist the 'scarab' shape did not have the sacred importance which a pious Egyptian would attach to it.‡ The conclusion that may thus be drawn from a consideration of the shape as revealing to a certain extent Egyptian influence, without an adherence to Egyptian ideas, accords with the character of the design on the seal. The figure is clearly that of a demon whose attitude, as well as the instrument he holds in his left hand, suggests a contest in which he is engaged. Apart from the crescent and star above the head which are so distinctly Babylonian, the wings, claws and tail also point to southern Mesopotamia as the source of the design. Nor need we seek long for a satisfactory explanation of the figure. The fight between a monster and a deity, based presumably upon the tale of the dragon Tiamat and the god Marduk, occurs as a quite frequent representation on Babylonian seals, both of ancient and more modern make, but the

---

\* The property of Mayer Sulzberger, Esq., of Philadelphia, by whom it was kindly placed at my disposal. The reproduction on a somewhat larger scale than the original is by the Levy-type process of Philadelphia.

† This method of attaching the seal is interesting as forming the link which leads from the seal cylinder suspended around the neck to the seal ring. It would appear that the Phoenicians were not only the first, as Perrot and Chipiez, *ib.* p. 259, suggest, to fix seals in rings but through them, if not directly, then indirectly, the next step was taken of wearing the seal on the finger. The natural evolution in the shape of the seal corresponding to this change in the fashion of wearing it, may be represented by the following scale—long cylinder, cone, scarab-eoids, gradually toned down till the more or less flat surface, in circular or square form is reached.

‡ See Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phoenicia*, I., 239.

variations in which this design is met with are numerous. This monster sometimes appears with the head of a bull or a unicorn, again of a lion, and again apparently of a bird; now with wings and sometimes without wings, with an instrument in his hand and without one,\* etc. Another and more important variation occurs when instead of against one monster, we find the deity fighting two monsters, one on either side, and corresponding to this enlargement of the "motif," we find a curtailing of it on other seals by a representation of the monster alone. This curtailing of a design is particularly common on seals of "Phoenician" manufacture superinduced no doubt by the smaller size of their seals as compared with those of the Babylonians, but it is to be noticed that it also occurs on seals of unquestioned Babylonian origin. So for example, the scene so common in seals of the worship of a deity, is curtailed by a representation of two persons instead of three or of the deity alone without the worshipers or of the worshiper alone, and again where we find on seals the crescent and star (or stars) alone or the tree, column, altar or the like without any accompaniment, we are justified in connecting these symbols with the worship "motif," and as originally forming part of a more complete scene.† Coming back to our seal, the attitude of the demon it seems to me, receives its explanation only if we suppose some figure before him against whom the attack is directed and I have, therefore, no hesitation in connecting the figure in some way with one of the Babylonian dragons and curtailed from some more complete scene. But the figure, while thus traceable to Babylonian models, cannot be called entirely Babylonian. There are at least, two details which may be set down as revealing Egyptian influence, viz., the head and the dress. In all the representations on distinctively Babylonian or Assyrian cylinders or on other works of Babylonian art, one finds no head like the one we have here, whereas the wolf-life features do most strongly suggest the Egyptian deity "Anubis." True, the snout on the Egyptian representations of the god is usually somewhat longer and sharper, but such a deviation is exactly one for which we ought to be prepared in a design based upon a mixture of Babylonian and Egyptian figures and in which through the preponderance of the Babylonian elements, we are not justified in looking for more than *traces* of Egyptian influence. Again, the dress of the demon is peculiar. As a general thing the Babylonian-Assyrian demons are naked; and moreover the ordinary garment on Babylonian seals is the loosely hanging one which permits the leg to be easily uncovered or the "hoop-skirt." An approach to our tight-fitting tunic may be recognized in the demons from a slab in Ašurbanipal's palace,‡ but the late

\* See Menant-Le Clercq *Collection Le Clercq, Cat.-Rais.*, etc., Pl. xxxi., Pl. xxxiii.; also Nos. 323bis. No. 150 is a curious combination of two bulls and two lions against a deity. Menant-Le Clercq fail to distinguish between representations of animal sacrifice and what are distinctly contests between deities and monsters.

† Numerous examples in Menant-Le Clercq, *ib.* Nos. 245, 255, 259-261 Pl. xx. etc. See also Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Chaldaea*, I. p. 74.

‡ Cf. Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Chaldaea*, I., p. 61.



period of this monument together with other indications warrant the suspicion of foreign influence. In Egypt, however, the tight-fitting short tunic is the common one and on an Egypto-Phoenician seal,\* containing several distinct "Anubis" figures we have almost the exact counterpart of the dress on our seal. We conclude then that the design shows that peculiar mixture of Babylonian and Egyptian element which has been ascertained to be the characteristic of Phoenician art in general, corresponding to the general eclecticism prevailing in the religious ideas and customs of the Phoenicians. Before proceeding to the inscription which further fixes the seal as distinctly "Phoenician," the question may be raised whether there are any indications in the design that justify conclusions as to its date. To this I venture to reply that the wings argue in favor of a late period. In the first place although distinctly Babylonian in shape, their large size in proportion to the stature of the animal shows a pronounced departure from early and even late Babylonian models. They are certainly not Egyptian, and approach the variation found in monuments of the Persian period. As a further indication of an influence that is neither Egyptian nor Babylonian, attention might be directed to the manner in which the wings are attached to the demons. They do not appear to be growths on the figure as is always the case in Babylono-Assyrian as well as Egyptian deities and monsters, but fastened to the animal by means of the belt around the waist, a feature which suggests the artificial attachment of wings in Greek art, as in the case of Hermes. At all events and be this as it may, the departure from Babylonian and Egyptian ideas on the seal is sufficiently pronounced to make a very late date preferable to an early one, and furthermore to suggest a place of manufacture for the seal removed from Egyptian or Babylonian centres of art. The inscription points in the same direction. It consists of two parts one to each side of the figure, the letters appearing reversed. Beginning with the side behind the figure, I read as follows:

### לארנגלח עברעמנרב

The characters are clearly cut and but for the curious form of one of them, might belong to a very early period. This one is the Hêth which here has a somewhat unusual shape. The cross line at the top, it ought to be added, turns out upon microscopic examination to be due to a dent in the stone, so that the latter comes quite near the form it has in late Phoenician seals and in monuments, more particularly those of western origin.

Regarding the juxtaposition of the two names, one might be tempted to suppose the first to be a title but for the fact that titles in Phoenician monuments, as among Semites in general, are invariably placed after the name of the persons

\* Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phœnicia*, I., p. 255, fig. 192. See also the Egypto-Assyrian seals in Menant-Le Clercq, Nos. 386-89; and (Pl. xxxviii.) 386 bis and 386 ter.

to whom they belong.\* Again it hardly seems reasonable to take עֶבֶר as “servant” literally, as some scholars in such cases are inclined to do. While no doubt the origin of proper names containing the element עֶבֶר followed by the name of some deity is due to a supposed actual relation of master and servant between a worshipper and his god, still the consciousness of this meaning attaching to the word must have died out when proper names from being invocations pronounced over a person and attached to him as a kind of talismanic formula grew to be simple appellations. Corresponding with this growth, the name of the deity following upon ‘abd came to be chosen quite promiscuously and with no defined religious aim. It will therefore be most satisfactory to assume with Levy (*Phoenizische Studien*, IV., p. 72), whom Euting (*Punische Steine*, p. 11) is inclined to follow, that the word for son בֶּן has been left out. This omission is very common on Palmyrene monuments (e. g. Sachau, *ZDMG.*, 1881, p. 424, and see Levy and Euting as above), and has with a great show of probability been traced to Greek influence—a supposition that, it will be seen, strengthens the general indications above referred to in favor of a late date for the seal. Taking the Lāmēdh at the beginning as the ordinary sign of possession the inscription is to be rendered thus:

[seal of] Adōngallah (son of) ‘Abdamōnrah.



Both names are new and extremely interesting. The first is compounded of two elements, the well-known Adōn and a stem גלח that has not as yet been met with on Phoenician inscriptions. Adōn appears as a general thing in Phoenician proper names combined with some other deity. Thus we have ארנבעל ארנשמש אשמנארן, ארנבל. But these names are not to be placed in the same category with such combinations as מלקרת-אשמן אל-חמן

\* Only in the case of deities we find such descriptive epithets as לבעל לארן לארני placed before the name itself, though occasionally also after the name (e. g. *Corpus Inscr. Sem.*, I, p. 24sqq.).



הדר-רמון where the idea conveyed is of the amalgamation of two deities, nor are they parallel with combinations of בעל, as פנבעל בעללבנן, where a particular manifestation of Baal is indicated, but the common use of Adôn as a mere epithet of deity (לארני לאשמן לארן, לבעלחמן, etc.), and also of persons (ארנמלכם and ארמלכם Levy, *Phoenizische Studien*, III., p. 34 sqq.; IV., p. 7), as also its use in such names as ארניבזק (see Schroeder *Phoeniz. Spr.*, pp. 9 and 178), shows that the word from designating originally a specific deity has advanced even beyond the stage of a generic term for "deity" like the Babylonian *ilu* to a term for "lord," or "master," being used precisely like the Hebrew equivalent, as Muenther, *Religion d. Karthager*, p. 25,\* already recognized. Accordingly Adôn bēl and Eshmunadôn are to be rendered simply, "the lord Bel" and "Eshmun is master," and applying this conclusion to the name on our seal, it will be seen that we are not justified in taking גלח as a verb, of which Adôn as a deity is the subject, but on the contrary if there is a divine element in the name it must be sought in the second part. The question now arises, what is גלח? There is no trace of a god *galaḥ* or *gallaḥ* among any of the Semites and the meaning of the stem which, from its occurrence in Hebrew, Arabic and several of the Aramaic languages, is very well known, makes it improbable that it should have ever been the name of a deity. With a primitive meaning like "scrape" or the like, we find the stem used in all the three groups mentioned for "shaving," more particularly the hair of the head, but in Hebrew at least, also of the face and other parts of the body. In Arabic, where the stem has a wider usage, it obtains the force also of plucking, rendering bald or bare (see Lane's *Arabic Dictionary*, s. v.) and allied meanings, while in Syriac the metaphorical application to "revealing, exposing" and then "expanding" appears to prevail. The Old Testament usage of the stem is particularly instructive, and the close relationship existing between Phoenician and Hebrew warrants us in starting from the latter for an explanation of the name under consideration. Almost all the passages in which the word occurs have a bearing on the religious significance which in the primitive Semitic ritual was attached to the cutting off of the hair. Both in the reference to the leper (Lev. 13:33; 14:8,9), and to the nazîr (Num. 6:9,18) גלח is used of the ordained shaving off of the hair, in the case of the former of the whole body, in the latter of the head, and since under the aspect of *taboo* both leper and nazîr were "sacred" there can be no doubt of the sacrificial purpose which the ceremony originally served.† Again in the case of the woman captured in war (Deut. 21:12), we have the *galaḥ* ceremony (for the head alone), which

\* An approach to the use of בעל like ארן appears in such a phrase as למלקרת בעל צר i. e. to Melkart, the master of Tyre (Gesenius, *Script. Ling. Phoen.*, p. 96).

† See the admirable discussion of "Hair-offerings" and Hair-rituals among the Semites in W. R. Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 306-15, where also references to the copious literature on the subject will be found.

here appears to be a rite of initiation into the tribe of the captor;\* thirdly there is the prohibition against shaving of the head and beard as a rite of initiation in the case of priests, recorded in Lev. 21:5 and Ezek. 44:20, and finally we have the valuable testimony of Jer. 41:5 to the actual religious practice, and the words of Isa. 7:20, "ביום ההוא יגלח אדני תער השכירה וג'", which, as the reference at the end of the verse to the head, limbs and "also beard" suggest, receive additional force by being brought into connection with some galaḥ-ritual.

Now there is abundant evidence that at all times the shaving of the head was observed as a rite among the Phoenician priests† and wherever Phoenician worship spread, as for example in the rites of the Phrygian Cybele,‡ the galaḥ-ceremony is found. According to Lucian indeed (*De Dea Syria*, § 55) the rite was practised by all persons at Hierapolis, where, as a preliminary to citizenship, they had to "shave their head and eyebrows."§ However this may be, we have now also the direct testimony of the inscriptions to the religious significance of the tonsure among the Phoenicians. On a Phoenician monument found near Larnaka (*Corpus Inscr. Sem.*, I., p. 92 sqq.) there is a mention among those entitled to the temple revenues (*Facies A*, l. 12), לגלכם פעלם על מלאכת, which Renan renders *tonsoribus operantibus pro ministerio*. However the difficult word קפא following upon מלאכת is to be understood, there is no doubt, as Renan suggests in his note to the passage (*ibid.*, p. 95), that the reference is to the barbers attached to the temple, for the purpose of performing the tonsure on the priests. The further proof for the sacredness of this office is furnished by the title גלב אלם "barber of the gods," i. e., "sacred barber," given to individuals on two Phoenician inscriptions (*Sainte Marie*, 1784 and 2110, cf. *CIS.*, I., p. 71).

\* In addition to the shaving of the head, there is also ordered the cutting of the nails. With this rite may be compared the injunction in the so-called "Sumerian family-laws" (V R. 25, 31 Haupt's *SFG.*, p. 34) to cut off the nails in the case of the son who severs the legal status existing between himself and his father, and in the case of the same severance between son and mother, the cutting off—in both cases the verb gallābu is used—of the muttatu, which I cannot help thinking, despite Haupt's suggestive remarks, *Beitr. z. Assyr.*, I., pp. 15, 16, must refer to hairs (perhaps to beard as sign of manhood or the hairs *circa membrum virile*). It seems to me that here too the rite symbolized originally the formal exit from one tribe or family and admittance into another. The transition from this view to the observance of the custom as a mark of subjection and then sign of disgrace, which appears already to prevail at the time of the "Sumerian" laws, is a natural one, when once the ideas underlying the rite are lost sight of or outgrown.

† See Mover's *Phoenizien*, I., 572-87, on the priesthood among the Phoenicians.

‡ The connection between the Phrygian and Phoenician rites is now universally admitted. See Ramsay in the *Encyclop. Brit.* article (9th ed., Vol. XVIII., p. 853a). Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie d. Alten Völker*, II., 389, already established the practical identity of the Cybele and Ashtarte rites, and he is followed by Boettger, *Ideen zur Kunst-Mythologie*, I., p. 281.

§ It is in this sense I think that the passage is to be interpreted, for when Lucian says "every one who entered the city," he can certainly mean only those who came for the purpose of settling there. Whether Lucian is altogether exact in stating that the priestly tonsure was universal is another matter. One is inclined to suspect that the "shaving of the hair" refers merely to the custom, referred to in Lev. 19:27, of cutting off the hair and beard, which is something different from the galaḥ-ceremony.



Coming back now to our name Adôngallah, it will readily be admitted that there is everything in favor of assuming a meaning for the stem גלח, similar to that which it obtains in Hebrew and that further this second element in the name stands in some connection with the religious tonsure. We may advance a step further and venture to assign a specific meaning to this second element. If גלח, which, as referring to a profession, is probably to be read *gallab* (cf. Schroeder, *Phoeniz. Sprache*, p. 167), is the barber, *gallah* as the "shaven" or "shorn one"\* would appear to be an appropriate name for the initiated one or more specifically for the priest. Is there any evidence in favor of this assumption? Now it is significant that this very word גלח in late Hebrew has become the common expression for "priest." The general supposition has been that it was first applied to Christian monks as a nickname because of the tonsure, which it is interesting to recall, was also prescribed by the Catholic Church as a preliminary to initiation into clerical orders. It occurs in Tišbi's *Hebrew Dictionary*. Buxtorf (*Lexicon Chald.* s. v.) also notes the word, and while I am unable to trace its use beyond the appearance of Christianity, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that as so many words current in "modern" Hebrew, it is very old. From the Hebrew it appears to have made its way into Arabic. In what is known as the Mauritanian-Arabic version of the Pentateuch (published by Th. Erpenius, Leyden, 1622) the word כהן, Gen. 47:22, is translated جالاج† and its occurrence here would go to show that the term designation in Phoenician for "priest" by the side of כהן, which occurs rather frequently, as also does the fem. כהנת once (Eshmunasar Inscript. 15), and like the Hebrew equivalent suggested by the tonsure which distinguished the Phoenician priests. In further support of this proposition I would call attention to a was not necessarily a nickname and that it was not restricted in its application to Christian monks.‡ My proposition then is to take גלח in our name as an actual

\* So I propose to read, since the *kaṭṭāl* form of the Semitic noun indicates both a profession and a habitual condition. See Stade, *Hebr. Gram.*, §217a; Caspari, *Arab. Gram.*, 5th ed.,

§234. Compare with גלח "one who has been shorn," Arabic عطار "one who has been perfumed," but also used of the "perfumer."

† See Castellus, *Lex. Heptaglotton*, s. v., גלח, where the word is also applied to a "celibate"; also Golius, *Lex. Arab.*, s. v., and (following Golius) Freytag, *Lex. Arab.-Lat.* s. v. The native Arabic lexicographers do not record the word, nor does Gawālikī mention it.

‡ *جالاج* occurs also as a proper name in Arabic, e. g., *احيعة ابن جالاج* (*Kūtab al-Führst* ed. Flügel, p. 202, 28; Ibn Khallican, *Biogr. Dict.* (Slane), I, p. 84, who, being expressly mentioned as an *anṣārī*, may fairly be considered to have born a genuine Arabic name. There are also names of places formed of the stem גלח, so e. g. *جالع* and *الجلعاء* (Jacut ed. Wüstenfeld, II., p. 98), and *Talmud Babli Nidd.* 69a, makes mention of a place גלחי in Sodom.

curious and interesting term which has hitherto been involved in considerable obscurity.

Roman writers make frequent mention of the Phrygian worship which was introduced into Rome at the time of the second Punic war.\* The deity around which the worship that appeared so strange to the Romans centered, was Cybele, the *mater magna*, and the officiating priests are invariably termed by the Romans, *galli*. Now the close connection between Phrygian and Phoenician rites (as intimated above) is placed beyond all doubts by the testimony of Lucian who applies the very same term γάλλος (*De Dea Syria*, §§ 5, 15, 55) to the Syrian priests.† The etymology currently adopted by Roman and Greek writers (e. g. *Festus De Verb. Signif.* Ovid *Festi* IV. 363, *Pliny Hist. Nat.* V., § 147, *Suidas Lexicon*, s. v., etc.) and that is still followed in modern works (so in the new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*) derives the word from a river Gallus in Phrygia (a tributary of the Sangarius) the waters of which were thought to have the power of making those who drank of them mad, and the name was accordingly applied to the priests of Cybele because of the fury they exhibited in the performance of the religious rites. The lameness of such an etymological *tour de force* needs no comment. Hieronymos followed by others tried to connect the word with the Gauls but naturally without success. Creuzer, *Symbolik and Mythol.*, II., 370, thinks it is a "Bithynian" word. Boettger, *Ideen zur Kunst Mythol.*, I., 280, explains it as "wanderer," but upon what grounds I do not know. Movers (*Phonizier*, I., 687) is the first of modern writers to properly seek for a Semitic origin of a word that belongs to a worship so distinctly Semitic, but the etymology he proposes, from גַּל "to turn," in allusion to the dances of the Phoenician and Phrygian priests has no warrant and can hardly be called happy. Sayce, who in a note in his *Hibbert Lectures* (p. 62), and without offering the slightest proof connects the word with the Assyrian *kalu* (an epithet of the priests) needs only a passing mention. Strangely enough, Alexander Polyhistor (Mueller, *Fragm. Histor. Graec.*, III., p. 202) preserves a tradition (adopted literally by Stoll in Roscher's *Mythol. Lexicon*) which ought to have put investigators on the right path. He says that the name was due to a person named *Gallus* who was the first priest of Cybele and that so far as the river is concerned it was so called after the priests and not *vice versa*. "What more natural and more common than that a foreign term should become in tradition a proper name? Leaving aside the question of the river altogether, which may be a mere coincidence, the notice in Alexander Polyhistor, points directly to *gallus* as a term for

\* It is well to take note of this period assigned for the introduction. The story in Livy xxix. 10, when stripped of its principal features clearly points to Phoenician influence as the immediate cause for the spread of Cybele worship in Rome, so that the connection in which the Cybele worship is brought with the Punic wars is only another induction of the identity of Phrygian and Phoenician rites.

† See also Scholz, *Goetzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den Hebraern*, p. 323.



priest and taking the evidence above brought forward together, it seems to me that *gallus* is none other than our Hebrew and Phoenician גלל. As for the loss of the final guttural, it is to be noticed that we have here the soft so-called unpointed ח which already in Assyrian has disappeared and whose loss in the Romanized and Greek form of a foreign word would only serve to confirm for the Phoenician the common tendency of the Semitic languages to the aspiration of the gutturals\* and even the hard ones. So *Plautus Poen.* VI., 16, writes *lia* = ליה and *ib.* V. 1, 3 *vi* = אחי. Other instances in Phoenician of this tendency are עמן—very common—המן—neo-punic—and even אמן (Levy, *Phoenizische Stud.*, IV., p. 82) for חמן; עמש “five” for חמש (Levy, *Phoeniz. Woerterb.* S. V.).† Finally, before proceeding to the second name, a word about the force of *adôn* in combination with gallah. With a precedent like עבדאלם (*CIS.*, I., p. 30; Levy, *Phoeniz. Stud.*, II., 32) “divine servant,” which must originally have designated some sacred office like עבדעלינים, (Gesenius, *Mon. Scrip. Phoen.*, p. 13), becoming a proper name, there is sufficient justification in accounting for our name in the same way. *Adôngallah*, then, I take it is nothing else than the “chief gallah,” the כהן גלל of the Phoenician worship and but for its position before *Abdamonrab*, it might very well be the title of the later, particularly in view of the express mention of an *Archigallus* by Roman writers, *Plin.*, *Hist. Nat.* 35, 10; *Tertull. Apol.* 25; *Servius Ad Aen.* XII. 116 at the head of the Cybele worship, of which term *Adôngallah* it will be seen is the exact equivalent. As it is, it will be safer to assume that *Adôngallah* like עבדאלם has passed into a proper name and is so used in the present instance.

Coming now to the second name, the three elements of which it is combined עבר, עמן, and רב are perfectly well-known but the combination is new. The first part is of course the well-known word which with בעל occurs oftenest in the formation of Phoenician names. The combination עברעמן is identical with עבדאמן (Levy, *Phoeniz. Stud.*, IV., p. 72), is moreover vouched for by the Tyrian Ἀβδάμων mentioned by Josephus (*Contra App.* I., 18) and parallel to בעל עמן (Levy, *Phoeniz. Stud.*, IV., 73).‡ It has been customary hitherto to take עמן in all instances as another form for חמן. (Cf. e. g., Levy, *Phoeniz. Stud.*, II., p. 119; Schroder, *Phoeniz. Sprache*, pp. 81, 125). In such combinations as בעל עמן, I believe this to be the case, but the question may be raised whether in combination with עבר, the element עמן (and אמי) may

See Renan, *Hist. Gen. d. Langues Semit.* 5th ed., p. 427.

\* This process has proceeded furthest in the case of the Samaritan where all distinctions between gutturals are lost sight of and even the hard ones are aspirated. The Assyrian retaining only the pointed ח follows next. See a paper by the writer on Assyrian and Samaritan, *Proc. A. O. S.*, October, 1886, p. cvlix.

† See Schroeder's *Phoeniz. Sprache*, pp. 79-98, exhaustive treatment of the gutturals in Phoenician.

‡ Comp. also מילכעמי and צבועמן Levy, *Phoeniz. Woerth.*

not be the Egyptian deity Amon? With P'thah, Horus, Osiris, Athor and Necho so frequent in Phoenician names, in accord with the amalgamation of Egyptian and Phoenician beliefs, there is every reason why we should also look for Amon. Moreover, there is one instance in which there can be no doubt that we have the Egyptian Amon in a proper name and that is the **אמננכא** occurring on a seal published by Gesenius (*Mon. Scrip. Phoen. tab.* 28, No. lxxvii.) and correctly explained by Levy (*ZDMG.* XI., p. 71) as Amon-Necho. 'Abd in proper names as a general thing, though not invariably, is followed by the name of a deity, and unless we are ready to accept the proposition that there was a Phoenician deity **חמן**\* for which the evidence does yet appear to be sufficient, it would seem but reasonable to admit the possibility of the god Amôn being contained in **עברעמן**? The possibility also remains of an actual confusion between the Phoenician and Egyptian term,† just as there appears to be a confusion between Egyptian Osiris, written **אסר** as an element in Phoenician names and the Assyrian Ashur, also written **אסר** (**אסררחם** *CIS.* II., p. 50, **אסרסרער**, p. 54), and *CIS.* II., p. 56, between *Athar* and the Egyptian *Athor* or Hathor. There is also a Punic mountain chain bearing the name Amon-Baal-Ithon mentioned by Strabo, *Geogr.* XVII., 13, and where it would also appear that the Egyptian deity is meant. What adds to the probability of **עמן** in our case being the Egyptian Amon is the unique addition of **רב**. The occurrence of this element in Semitic names in general is rather rare‡ and I find only one doubtful instance of its being attached to a Phoenician deity, namely, **מעקר רב** (Gesenius, *Mon. Scrip. Phoen.*, p. 217) and which Gesenius thinks stands for **מלקרתרב**. The prominent rank held by Melkarth would render the combination intelligible, but that would hardly be the case if our **עמן** were the equivalent of **חמן** which even, if originally a deity, at an early period lost its distinctive character as such. "The servant of great Amon," however, strikes one at once as far more plausible. At the same time one is strongly tempted to suspect that some confusion—possibly a species of "popular etymology"—with the well-known Amon-Ra of the Egyptians has taken place in the case of the name on our seal. I have no evidence to offer by way of support for this conjecture which is thrown out merely in the nature of a suggestion that may bear examination. So far, however, as the occurrence of an Egyptian deity in our seal is con-

\* See the note in Gesenius, *Handw.* 10th ed., p. xxii. Regarding **חמן** it ought to be said that whether a deity or not, the final nûn is probably nothing but the tenwin and the question suggests itself whether we have not the same word in the Himyaritic proper name **חמעתת** (*CIS.*, IV., p. 31, 38 and 53), and also in the Babylonian King Hammurabi, rejecting the etymology for the name offered by the Babylonians themselves (III Rawl. 44, I., 21) as "great family," which is hardly an appropriate designation for an individual.

† Hamaker, *Miscell. Phoen.* (1828), pp. 49 and 57, appears to suspect some connection between **חמן** and Egyptian Amon.

‡ Cf. Hammurabi in Babylonian, Rabê in Himyaritic (*CIS.* IV., pp. 27 and 101); and Euting *Nab. Inschr.* 21, 3; 27, 14; 28, 3; Rib-addi (*ZA.* IV., pp. 404).



cerned, it will be seen that it accords perfectly with the indications of Egyptian influence that were found in the shape and design of the seal and perhaps it will be admitted that the unusual character of the first name renders the proposition of explaining the second as "Servant of Amon-Ra" less bold and startling than it might otherwise be. The traces of Egyptian influence are together perhaps strong enough to warrant us in classing the seal among those known as Egypto-Phoenician,\* though there is no need of insisting upon this. If a date were to be assigned to the seal, I should feel inclined to say, not earlier than the fifth century B. C.

---

\* Menant *Le Clercq Catalogue Raisonné*, etc., p. 28.

## AN ARABIC VERSION OF THE ABGAR-LEGEND.

BY PROFESSOR R. J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College in the City of New York.

It is not my intention to discuss here the interesting legend which is connected with the early history of Edessa as a christian city. That has lately been done with much learning and care.<sup>1</sup> I wish only to call attention to the following Arabic version which, I believe, has not been known heretofore—and to point out with what lines in the development of the legend it runs parallel.

Tixeront has collected (*loc. cit.* p. 28) the titles of four Arabic MSS. of the Abgar legend. The vatican text he has himself published at the end of the volume. With this our MS. has many points in common: but it is easy to see that it is greatly amplified. The one published by Ludovicus de Dieu<sup>2</sup> is not accessible to me at present.

A glance is enough to show us that the chief interest of the writer lies in the legend regarding the image of Jesus, rather than in that of the letters between him and Abgar. It belongs, therefore, to the Byzantine line of development. It is not necessary to adduce proof for this statement. We can go one step further, and can fix upon the Greek MS. which evidently lies back of our Arabic text.

There is a MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna (*cod. theol. graec.* 315) which has been described by Lambecius, and of which Lipsius has given some extracts.<sup>3</sup> The scope of both texts is the same: the letters of Abgar and Jesus; the story of the picture put on the handkerchief; the second image made on a brick at Heliopolis; the healing of the lame man; the healing of Abgar himself; the mission of Thaddaeus and the baptism of Abgar. Some of the characteristic additions in *cod.* 315 to the account in Eusebius are found again here: e. g., καὶ γυνᾶκα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀφαμένην σου ἰάσω = وامرأة نازفة والدم لها لمست يديك فبريت. So also the addition καὶ ἡ πόλις σου ἦτις καλεῖται ἔδεσσα = وللمدينة الرها;<sup>4</sup> although some of the additions in *cod.* 315 are wanting in the Arabic.

For the sake of comparison I have reprinted the four continuous extracts of *cod.* 315 as published by Lipsius.

<sup>1</sup> Tixeront, *Les origines de l'Église d'Édesse*, etc. Paris, 1888. Dashian, *Zur Abgar-Sage*. WZKM. iv., pp. 17 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Tixeront, *loc. cit.* p. 28. Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgar-Sage*, p. 20. Nestle, *De Santa Cruce*, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.* pp. 16, 21, 56, 59, 62.

<sup>4</sup> Lipsius, p. 16.



αὕτη δέ μου ἐπιστολὴ ὅπου ἂν προβληθῇ εἴτε ἐν δίκῃ ἢ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ, εἴτε ἐν ὁδῷ εἴτε ἐν θαλάσῃ, εἴτε ἐν ῥηγμῶσιν [l. ῥηγούσιν] εἴτε ἐν πυρέσσουσιν ἢ φορικῶσιν ἢ ἐκβράζουσιν ἢ κατάδεσμον ἔχωσιν [l. ἔχουσιν] ἢ ὑπέρβρασιν, ἢ φαρμακευθεῖσιν ἢ ὅσα τούτοις ὁμοια, διαλυθῇσονται. ἔστω δὲ ὁ φορῶν αὐτὴν ἄνθρωπος ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος, καὶ λεγέτω· αὕτη μὲν εἰς ἴασιν εἶναι [ἔσται?] καὶ χαρὰν βέβαιαν. διότι ὁ λόγος γραπτὸς γέγραπται τῇ ἰδίᾳ μου χειρὶ μετὰ τῆς σφραγίδος τῆς ἐμῆς. αἵτινες εἰσὶν ἐντετυπωμέναι [sic] τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ταύτῃ ἑπτὰ σφραγίσιν. T. Ψ. X. E. Y. P. A. ἰησοῦς χριστὸς υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ υἱὸς μαρίας φυγὴν φέρων ἐν δύο φύσεσιν γνωριζόμενος, θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος. τῶν δὲ σφραγίδων ἡ λύσις ἦν αὕτη. ὁ μὲν T δηλοῖ, ὅτι ἔκων ἐπάγγην ἐν σταυρῷ. τὸ δὲ Ψ, ὅτι φιλὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐκ εἰμί, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθ. τὸ δὲ X, ὅτι ἀναπέπνυμαι ὑπὸ τῶν χειρῶν βίμ. τὸ E, ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος ἐγὼ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, καὶ πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἐστὶ θεὸς ἕτερος. τὸ Y, ὑψηλὸς βασιλεὺς καὶ θεὸς τῶν θεῶν. τὸ P, ῥύστης εἰμί τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους. τὸ A, δι' ὅλου καὶ διηνεκῶς καὶ διὰ παντὸς ζῶ καὶ διαμένω εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ταύτας οὖν τὰς σφραγίδας ἐχάραξα ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ὁ χαράξας τὰς πλάκας τὰς δοθείσας τῷ μωσῇ.

καὶ δεξάμενος ὁ αὐγαρος τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπιστολήν, ἀκούσας ὅτι καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπείγονται [cod. ἐπήγοντε] τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν κύριον. πέμψας οὖν αὐτίκα ἐπ' αὐτὸν (?) ταχυδρόμιον τῇ τέχνῃ ζώγραφον τοῦ λαβεῖν τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ κυρίου. καὶ εἰσελθόντος τοῦ ταχυδρόμου εἰς τὰ προπύλαια ἱεροσολύμων ὑπήντησεν ὁ κύριος αὐτῷ [cod. αὐτόν]. καὶ διαλεχθεὶς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. κατὰσκοπος εἶ ἄνθρωπε. ἐκεῖνος δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν· ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμί ὑπὸ ἀγγάρου θεάσασθαι ἰησοῦν τὸν ναζωραῖον τοῦ λαβεῖν τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ [cod. τὸ] προσώπου αὐτοῦ. καὶ συνετάξατο οὖν ὁ ἰησοῦς παραγενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν· τῇ δὲ ἑξῆς ἀπελθὼν ὁ ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ τῆς συναγωγῆς, ἐκαθέζετο διδάσκων τοὺς ὄχλους. ὁ δὲ ταχυδρόμος εἰσελθὼν ἔστη εἰς τὸ προπύλαιον ζωγραφῶν τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ ἰησοῦ. καὶ μὴ δυναμένου καταλαβέσθαι τὴν μορφήν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, κατέλαβε καὶ ὁ σύνδρομος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὠθήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν· εἴσελθε καὶ ἀπόδος ἡν περιέχεις σινδόνα τοῦ ἀγγάρου [τοῦ τοπάρχου] καὶ δεσπότης ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς συναγωγῆς. καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐπὶ πάντων ἔπεσεν εἰς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ ἰησοῦ ἀποδόσας αὐτῷ τὴν σινδόνα. καὶ λαβὼν ὕδωρ ὁ κύριος ἐν ταῖς χειρσὶν αὐτοῦ ἀπενίψατο τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὴν σινδόνα ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἀνεζωγραφήθη [cod. ἀνεζωγραφίσθη]. καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ ἰησοῦ ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὥστε

θαυμάζειν πάντας τοὺς καθημένους μετ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ δοὺς τὴν σινδὼνα τῷ ταχυδρόμῳ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τὸν αὐγαρον.

ἐλθόντες οὖν οἱ ταχυδρόμοι ὡς μιλίου ἐνὸς τῆς πόλεως ἐδέσσης συρόμενός τις εὐρέθη κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. καὶ ἀφάμενος τῆς ἀγίου σινδώνος εὐθέως ἤλετο καὶ περιεπάτη καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁρομαῖος πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν μητέρα χαίρων καὶ ἀγαλλιώμενος καὶ θεαθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων. ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τῇ γεγονότι εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον. οὐχ οὗτος ἦν ὁ συρόμενος τῆσδε τῆς χήρας ὁ υἱός; καὶ εὐθέως ἀνηνέχθη τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐγάρῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ μετακαλεσάμενος αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγει αὐτῷ· πῶς ἰάθης; ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν ὡς ἀπὸ μιλίου ἐνὸς παρεγενόμενῃ τῆς πόλεως αἰτῶν. καὶ τις ἤφατο μου καὶ ἀνθρωπώθην καὶ περιεπάτησα. ὁ δὲ αὐγαρος ὑπέλαβεν, ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς ἦν καὶ πέμφας εὔρε τὸν ταχυδρόμον μετὰ τοῦ συνδρόμου αὐτοῦ, ἐπιφέροντας [cod. ....τες] τὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ εἰκόνα. καὶ ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ παλάτιον ἐδέξατο αὐτοὺς ἐν χαρᾷ καὶ ἀσπασίως ὁ αὐγαρος κατακείμενος ἐπὶ κλίνης. ἐξέστη καὶ δεξάμενος τὴν σινδὼνα εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ μετὰ πίστεως ἔαθη παραχρῆμα. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀναληφθῆναι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἀπέστειλε θαδδαῖον ἐν ἐδέσσει τῇ πόλει τοῦ ἰάσασθαι αὐγάρου πᾶσαν [R. καὶ πᾶσαν] μαλακίαν. ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ θαδδαῖος καὶ λαλήσας αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατηχήσας ἐκατέβη ἐπὶ τὴν πηγὴν τὴν λεγομένην κερασσὰ καὶ ἐβάπτισεν αὐτὸν πανοικί. καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθερίσθη αὐτοῦ τὸ πάθος. καὶ ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι δοξάζων καὶ εὐλογῶν τὸν θεὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ ταχυδρόμος καὶ ὁ σύνδρομος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἔμειναν ἔξω πόλεως ὀνόματι ἱεράπολις εἰς κεραμαρεῖον [l. κεραμεῖον]. Καὶ φοβηθέντες ἔχρυψαν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χριστοῦ ἀνὰ μεταξὺ δύο κεραμιδίων καὶ ἐκοιμήθησαν. κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσουύκτιον ἐφάνη στύλος πυρὸς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔστη ἐπάνω, οὗ ἦν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ κυρίου. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ καστροφύλαξ τῆς πόλεως τὸν στύλον τοῦ πυρός ἐφώνησεν φωνὴν μεγάλην, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λαὸς τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἰδόντες τὴν ἐν σινδόνι εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἤθελον αὐτὴν λαβεῖν. Καὶ φηλαφῆσαντες εὔρου ὅτι ἀνεζωγραφῆθη εἰς ἓν τῶν κεραμιδίων καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ κεραμίδιον, ἐσίγησαν ἑάσαντες τοὺς ταχυδρόμους πορεύεσθαι.

The MS. from which the present text is taken is now in the Library of Columbia College. It is incomplete at the end. Its general title is as follows:   
 بِسْمِ الْاَبِ الْاَبْنِ وَالرُّوحِ الْقُدُسِ الْاِلَهِ الْوَاحِدِ. نَبْتَدِي نَكْتَبُ اَخْبَارَ



تصص الشهد او القديسين الذين ارضوا الله بصالح اعمالهم وصفة سيرتهم الفاضلة صلواتهم وبركاتهم تحفظنا واياكم سرمد امين. The contents are apochryphal in character. The MS. is quite modern, and is written without a too strict regard for the niceties of grammar or of correct spelling. In fact many very modern—and, at times perhaps, incorrect—forms have found entrance.<sup>5</sup> But it is impossible to tell the exact date of the original text; and it would have been wrong to correct all things according to the Mufaṣṣal.<sup>6</sup> I have therefore only called attention to what seemed to me to be evident mistakes.

نكتب رسالة ملك الرها الابجر رسلها الى ربنا يسوع المسيح.  
 قد بلغنى عن عجايبك. وعنك انك بلا سكر ولا دوا بتشفى المرضى.  
 وانك بكلمة واحدة. وهبت للعميان النظر ولزمننا الشفى وللخرص  
 التكلم وللصم السماع وللمرضا الشفا وتطرد الارواح النجسة بكلمتك.  
 5 والذى دحرهم الوجع والعداب تشفيهم وتقيم الموتى وامراة نازفة<sup>7</sup>  
 الدم لما لمست يديك<sup>8</sup> فبريت فيا سيدى بلغنى عنك ظنيت في  
 قلبك انك الله او انك ابن الله نذلت من السما وفعلت هذا كله. يا  
 سيدى فمن اجل هذا اسالك انا واتوسل اليك ان تاتى لعندى وان كنت  
 انا غير مستحق اتكنن على واحضر لى تشفينى من هذا الالام  
 10 الذى فى وبلغنى ايضا ان اليهود قد مقتوك وهم ان يظلموك وليس  
 خافيك اننى انا فى مدينة صغيرة لطيلنه<sup>9</sup> اشهيت ان تكون لى انا  
 وانت ولك السلام كما تريد\*  
 جواب رسالة الملك الابجر الذى هى من عند سيدنا يسوع  
 المسيح.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. بتشفى l. c. cf. Spitta, *Grammatik des Arab. Vulgardiialects von Ägypten*, p. 203 (ZDMG. 44, 543). JA. 1887. Extrait No. 22, p. 8. نذل l. 50, for نزل. Spitta, loc. cit., p. 18. مثل for مسل.

<sup>6</sup> See Sachau, *Chronologie Orientalischer Völker von Albērūnī*. Introd. p. lxx.

<sup>7</sup> MS. نازفة. <sup>8</sup> Conjectural: the MS. is blotted here. <sup>9</sup> So the MS. Read لطيفة.

يقول هكذا طوابك يا ابجر وللمدينتك الرها. طوابك لانك لم<sup>15</sup>  
 ترانى وامنت ومن الان وهبت لك العافية والشفاء واما ما كتبت  
 لى من اننى<sup>10</sup> اجى اليك ناولا واجب لى ان اتممت العمل الذى وردت  
 لاجله واصعد الى عند من ارسلنى ارسل لك احد من تلاميذى وهو  
 يشفى مرضك ويهب لك الحيا الداعية والسلامة لك والى من فى<sup>20</sup>  
 مدينتك الذى لا ينبغى لاحدا من الناس ان يقدر عليها الى انقضا  
 العالم امين\*

يا خوه<sup>11</sup> هذه الرسالة مكتوبة بيد والاهنا يسوع المسيح وختمها  
 بختامة<sup>12</sup> سبعة ختوم حروف يونانية بيد الخاصة الخاتم الاول يدل  
 اننى باختبارى تقدمت للصلب والثانى<sup>13</sup> بانى انسان تام والاه<sup>25</sup>  
 بالحقيقة والثالث فاننى رفعت على الشاروبيم<sup>14</sup> والرابع ان الاله الاول  
 وليس الاله اخر سواى الخامس ملك عالى انا واله الالهت<sup>15</sup> السادس  
 صرت مخلص السابع بالكلية فى كل حين انا حى دايم الى دهر  
 الداهرين. هذه الرسالة من حملها براسة تنجية من خطر الطريق  
 ومن واجه الحكام والسلاطين تخلص ومن به حمار دية تشفيه ومن<sup>30</sup>  
 بهم ارواح سوا وشى من السكر ينجيهم ومن كان فى مجا وفى نهر  
 او فى قتال او فى كل شى سيتم على الانسان تجل عليه وان كان  
 مقعد بتريه ويكون حاملها محفوظ من كل اعمال الشرير وتكون له  
 شقا لروحه وجسده ويكون له الفرح والسرور دايم سمردان امين.

<sup>10</sup> MS. has اتى.

<sup>11</sup> Read يا اخوة.

<sup>12</sup> MS. بختامت. In other places I have simply substituted ت for ت.

<sup>13</sup> MS. والثانى. In other places I have simply substituted ث for ت. Cf. Miḥāil Sab-  
 bāg's *Grammatik der Arab. Umgangssprache in Syrien und Ägypten*, p. 12.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Dozy, *Supplement*, i. 715. Muḥīṭ al Muḥīṭ, p. 1802.

<sup>15</sup> Read الالهات.



35 فلما قبل الابجر رسالة الرب فدا دشوقه وغرامه<sup>16</sup> به وحالاً وجه  
 مصور ماهر جداً حادثاً فارسله لكي ان يمسك بمسك الرب  
 وبمسك وجهه<sup>17</sup> ففسار المصور في الطريق حتى انه التقا بالرب  
 سبحانه فخطابه قايلًا انت ايها الانسان كلوس فاجابه قايلًا انا  
 مرسل من عند ابجر لكي انظر يسوع الناصري واتميز مثال<sup>18</sup>  
 40 وجهته وامثلها فامر الرب ان يقيم مع الجمع وعرفه في حاله انه  
 هو يسوع الناصري فجلس يسوع معلم الشعوب فاراد المصور يتم امر  
 سيده فوقف مقابل الرب ليصور مثالة وجهه فما كان يقدر يمثل وجه  
 الرب فقال الرب للرسول اين السفينة التي معك فتقدم الرسول  
 مسرعاً نكحوا الرب وطرح نفسه على قدميه ودفع له السفينة قدام  
 45 الشعوب فاخذها السيد على يديه وغسل وجهه بماء ومسحه بتلك  
 السفينة حتى تعجب الرسول المصور وكل الجمع تعجب فدفعها  
 للرسول فاخذها وهو فرحان الرسول وانطلق الى عند سيده الابجر  
 وهو ساير في الطريق هو ورفاقه فانتهوا الى مدينة مبسج فباتوا  
 خارج المدينة في فاخورة الفخار فوضع صورة المسيح بين قرميدين  
 50 خوفاً من اللصوص وناموا ففي تلك الليل نذل<sup>19</sup> عامود نار اخضر  
 ووقف على صورة المسيح فلما مر<sup>20</sup> حراس تلك المدينة فنظر  
 تلك العجب العظيم فتعجب فصرخ بصوت عالي حتى خرجها  
 جميع الناس لخارج المدينة ونظروا العجب فهموا ان ياخذوها من

<sup>16</sup> MS. وعمره .

<sup>17</sup> MS. ووجهه a mistake, if we ought not to read وجهه .

<sup>18</sup> MS. here and in other places مسال . Cf. Spitta loc. cit. p. 9.

<sup>19</sup> I. e. نزل .

<sup>20</sup> I. e. مر .

الرسول ففتشو بين القرميدين فراوها قد لزقت بواحدة من  
القرميدين فآخذ هو قرميدة الصورة وارضاهم في قرميدة الثانية<sup>55</sup>  
فاسار الرسول حتى دنى في مدينة الرها مقدار ميل وان بانسان مقعد  
لمس بيده الصورة فللوقت فبرى حالاً فمشى قايمًا وجرى لعند امه  
للمدينة مسرعاً فلما بصرت امه والعالم تعجبوا وصاروا جايدين  
ويقولوا بعضهم لبعض ما هذا ابن<sup>21</sup> الارملة المقعد فوصل خبره للملك<sup>60</sup>  
فاحضره لعنده وقال له كيف برئت فاجابه قايلًا اننى من مقدار ميل  
واحد من المدينة وانا جالس اطلب صدقة من الناس وان بواحد  
ماررا في الطريق فالتمنى فللوقت قمته واقفا فافتكر الملك  
الابجر ان مراسله جابه وصورة المسيح معه. فارسل بلقاهم فوجد  
الرسول مع رفيقه حاملين صورة السيد المسيح فلما وصلوا الى البلاط<sup>65</sup>  
اخذ الملك تلك الصورة على يديه وهو مطروح على السرير من  
مدة ستة سنين وسويه فللوقت برى بالساعة وتعافوا<sup>22</sup> ان سيدنا  
يسوع المسيح بعد صعوده الى السما ارسل تدأوس تلاميذه<sup>23</sup> لنى اعد  
الابجر فشفاه من كافة امراضه وعرفه طريق الحق وكلام الحق  
وانحدر الى عين ما تسما كارسا فعمده بها وجميع<sup>24</sup> اهل بيته بسم الاب<sup>70</sup>  
والابن والروح القدس الاله واحد وتهلل بروح القدس وهو يسبح  
اليه المجد الى دهر الداهرين فهذا ماء<sup>25</sup> انتها اليها من امر الملك  
السعيد الابجر وتمننه سبحانه الله تعالى في ملكه امين. تم امين.

<sup>21</sup> MS. هداين.

<sup>22</sup> ويقال ؟

<sup>23</sup> Read. تدأوس احد من.

<sup>24</sup> MS. ولجميع.

<sup>25</sup> Sic!



كما يقول اطلبوا تجدوا واقرعوا يفتح لكم ينجينا اليه تعالى من  
جميع الشدايد كما نجا<sup>26</sup> هذا الملك العسيد امين تم امين.

We shall write the letter of the King of Edessa, Abgar, which he sent to our master Jesus, the Messiah.

I have heard of thy wonderful deeds and that thou dost heal the sick without enchantment and without medicine; and that thou, by means of one word, hast given sight to the blind and to the lame recovery, to the dumb speech, to the deaf hearing, to the sick healing. Thou casteth out unclean spirits by thy word, and those whom pain and punishment injure thou healest. Thou raisest the dead; and the woman flowing with blood, when she touched thy hands became well. And now, O Master, I have heard that thou thinkest in thy heart that thou art God or the Son of God. Thou hast come down from heaven and hast done all this, O Master! On this account I beg and request of thee that thou come to me. Although I am not worthy, do thou show mercy to me and come so that thou mayest heal me from this pain which is in me. I have also heard that the Jews hate thee and wish to do thee harm. It is not hidden from thee that I am in a city, small and beautiful. I wish that it be for me and for thee. And to thee be peace—as thou wilt.

Answer to the letter of King Abgar which came from our master Jesus, the Messiah.

He says as follows: Blessed art thou, O Abgar and thy city Edessa. Blessed art thou, in that thou didst believe in me, not having seen me. From the present time I have given thee health and healing. Now regarding that about which thou hast written to me that I should come to thee, first it is necessary that I should complete the work for the sake of which I have come down. And [when] I shall have ascended unto Him that sent me, I shall send to thee one of my disciples that he may heal thy disease and give to thee eternal life. Peace be to thee and to those who are in thy city, which no man will be able to take to the end of the world. Amen.

O brother! This letter was written by the hand of our master and our God, Jesus, the Messiah, and he sealed it with seven seals in Grecian characters by means of a eunuch.<sup>27</sup>

The first seal showed "I, of my own free will, went to the cross." The second, "that I am a perfect<sup>28</sup> man and God in very truth." The third, "that I have ascended to the cherubim." The fourth "that [I] am God, the first,

<sup>26</sup> MS. نَجَا.

<sup>27</sup> I do not find this form in the dictionaries: but it must be some derivative of ḥaṣa(y) "he drew forth, or castrated his testicles" (Lane S. V.).

<sup>28</sup> Or *real*.

and that there is no other God beside me." The fifth, "that I am an exalted King and God of Gods." The sixth, "I am the Saviour." The seventh, "altogether, at all times I live, existing forever." Whoever bears this letter upon his head, it will save him from the danger of the road; and he who meets wise men and rulers, it will spare him; he who has a strong fever, it will heal him; and those who have evil spirits or any other form of enchantment, it will free them. He who is on the road,<sup>29</sup> or on a river, or in a battle or in anything that happens to a man, it will release him [from his difficulty]. And if anyone be seated in ————— and carry it, he will be free from all unpleasant labor. It will be medicine for his spirit and his body: and joy and gladness will be to him forever and ever. Amen.

Now when Abgar had received the letter of the master, his desire and his wish grew strong; and at once he sent a very skillful sculptor. He directed him to go to procure a likeness of the master and of his face. Then the sculptor went on his way until he reached the master, praised be he! Then he spake to him saying: Verily thou art a sculptor.<sup>30</sup> Then he answered him, saying, I am sent by Abgar to see Jesus, the Nazarene, to see the likeness of his face and to picture it. The master commanded him to take his place with the multitude. Then he told him of himself that he was Jesus the Nazarene. Then Jesus sat down to teach the people and the sculptor wished to fulfil the behest of his superior. He placed himself opposite the master in order to paint the likeness of his face. But he was not able to picture the likeness of the face of the master. Then said the master to the messenger, where is the handkerchief(?)<sup>31</sup> which thou hast. Then the messenger came quickly to the master and threw himself at his feet and gave him the handkerchief before all the people. Then the master took it in his hands, washed his face with the water and wiped it with the handkerchief so that the sculptor who had been sent and all the people wondered. Then he gave it to the messenger who seized it joyfully and went to his superior, Abgar. This one was journeying upon the road with his escort. They had come to the city MBSJ.<sup>32</sup> They remained over night outside the city in the shop of a potter: and placed the image of the Messiah between two bricks out of fear of robbers. Then they slept. Now during the night there came down a dark pillar of fire upon the image of the Messiah. And when the guard of that city passed by and saw this great wonder, they were amazed and cried out with a loud cry until a multitude of people came

<sup>29</sup> The lexica do not give this derivation of جاء; but it must correspond to the Greek ἐν ὁδῷ.

<sup>30</sup> In the Greek text, we read κατὰσκοπος εἰ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>31</sup> MS. السفينة which is undoubtedly a mistake. Ibn el Athir, VIII., p. 302, 21 has منديل cf. also Tixeront, *loc. laud.* p. 199.

<sup>32</sup> Read منبج Mabug. Greek has ἱεράπολις.

to the outskirts of the city. They saw the wonder and desired to take it (i. e. the picture) from the messenger. They searched between the two bricks, and saw that it was fixed fast to one of them. Then [the messenger] caught hold of one of the bricks, and gave them the second one. Then the messenger journeyed until he had come to within one mile of the city of Edessa. Here he lighted upon a man deprived of the use of his limbs who touched the picture with his hand. At that very moment he became completely well and went on his way standing upright. He came quickly to the city to his mother and when the other people saw him they wondered, and came saying to each other: what has come over the widow's son who had not the use of his legs? His story reached the King who had him brought to him. Then he said to him, how hast thou become healed? He answered him saying, behold I was seated about a mile distant from the city. I was seated looking for alms from men when something passed secretly up the road and touched me and at once I arose upright. And King Abgar understood at once that this messenger had come back to him with the picture of the Messiah. Then he sent to meet them and he found the messenger with his escort, bearing the image of the master, the Messiah. Now when they had come to the palace, the King took this image in his hands, he having lain upon his couch for a little over six years. At once, at that moment, he was healed and became well.

Now, our master, Jesus the Messiah, after his ascent to heaven sent Thaddaeus [one of] his disciples to Abgar and he healed him from all his sickness. He taught him the way of life and the word of truth. And he went down to a well of water which was called كارسا,<sup>33</sup> and he baptized him in it and all the people of his household in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God. And he gloried in the Holy Spirit and praised God who is to be glorified unto all generations.

Now this is what has reached us about the glorious King Abgar and the doings(?) of God, praised and exalted be, in his kingdom. Amen! Amen! As is said, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.<sup>34</sup> May God the exalted one free us from every misfortune as he freed this exalted King! Amen! Amen!

<sup>33</sup> In Greek *κερασσά*.

<sup>34</sup> Matthew 7:7.



## NOTES ON THE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS XXXII.-L.\*

BY BENJAMIN W. BACON,

Oswego, N. Y.

There can be no doubt in the mind of critics that we have in Gen. XXXII. 1-3 and 4-13 respectively E's and J's story of Mahanaim, though the question must doubtless be considered still open whether, as Wellhausen holds, E in ver. 3 really takes the name **מַחֲנֵים** as a singular with locative ending (cf. **מַחֲנֶה** 3a); or whether, as Dillmann maintains, E as well as J understood it as a dual, his own host and God's being the "two companies." There seems to be, however, a general and very natural tendency to react from the stringency of Wellhausen's analysis, in the excision of portions like vs. 10-13, from a context with which they agree in style and language, on the ground of difference in subject-matter and point of view. Dillmann's inclusiveness, which has strong support in the practical identity in vocabulary, phraseology and style, of passages such as Gen. XII. 10 sqq., XVIII. 23 sqq., etc., with the rest of J, is apparently and perhaps justly gaining in favor. Nevertheless in the case of vs. 10-13 I am obliged to side with Wellhausen in attributing the verses to J<sup>2</sup>. The reference to XXXI. 3 is not decisive; the new etymology of Mahanaim, ver. 11, might have stood originally in J side by side with that of ver. 8. "Jordan" even, ver. 11, can perhaps be explained, if "Jabbok," v. 23, is from E, as an inconsistency of J with his own situation; but over and above these formidable objections to the authenticity of the passage comes ver. 13 undertaking to give the language of Yahweh's promises to Jacob and quoting a combination of XVI. 10 and XXII. 16, both certainly of origin subsequent to the union of J and E, and neither addressed to Jacob. If any promise of the kind was given to Jacob in J we should be driven to assume that it stood originally in ch. XXVIII. and has disappeared without any special reason, and to make the further assumption that J had a narrative of the theophany at Bethel

\* See HEBRAICA, VII., 1, 2 and 3, and the author's *Bibles within the Bible*. Student Pub. Co., Hartford, Conn. (In press.) Also *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, IX, 2, 1890.

The author may be permitted to insert here a communication from Dr. Karl Budde, of Heidelberg, on the subject of the evidence from Deut. IV. 32 sq. in favor of an Elohistie creation story of J<sup>2</sup> underlying the present Gen. I., in the preceding article, HEBRAICA, VII. 3, p. 222, which arrived too late for insertion in that number. Dr. Budde writes: Ein schöner Beweis..... ist wieder Ihre schöne Beobachtung an Deut. IV. 32, die mir ganz neu war. Ich bin ganz mit Ihnen derselben Meinung, dass dies einzige **בְּרָא** bei D zusammen mit **אֱלֹהִים** eine vollkommene Erklärung eigentlich nur in einer früheren Fassung von Gen. I. 36 sq. von der Hand eines J<sup>2</sup> finden kann (vgl. **בְּרָא** auch Ex. XXXIV. 10, soviel ich sehe, von spät-jahwistischer Hand). Das ist wirklich sehr überraschend und für mich eine grosse Genugthung.

already previous to this time, which is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. The sermonic tone of the passage has been pointed out by Wellhausen.

The two clauses 14a and 22b are practically identical. Their assignment severally to E or J will depend upon that of vs. 14b-22a; for 22b is inseparable from 22a. Now it is true that all critics agree in attributing 14b-22a to E, partly on the ground that in ver. 22b we are brought back to the point of 14a and partly because 22b knows of only one "company," and to controvert this unanimous opinion may seem hazardous; yet as the analyses of ch. xxxii. heretofore advanced confessedly involve very serious difficulties in ch. xxxiii. or *vice versa*, the reader's attention may reasonably be invited to certain evidence for assigning vs. 14b-22 as well as vs. 4-9 to J.

The first of the two arguments above cited in favor of 14b-22a as E's is readily met by simply connecting 14a with ver. 3, the nearest E section. We are then indeed brought back to the same point in ver. 22 as in ver. 14a (ver. 3), but this only makes vs. 4-9, 14b-22 = vs. 1-3, 14a, not 4-14a = 14b-22. The second assumes that J would not have written **במחנה** (ver. 22) if he had previously spoken of *two* camps. Wellhausen (*Comp. d. Hex.*, p. 45) translates in ver. 22 "in Mahaneh." But supposing Wellhausen to be wrong and that the allusion is indeed to Jacob's double camp on the northern shore, the author had no alternative but to express himself in this way in order to present the intended contrast between the band which crossed the river and that which remained behind. If the author meant "in this party rather than in that," he could not have said **במחנים**, for this would have been taken as the proper name. On the other hand he could say without real ambiguity **במחנה** "in the camp," meaning thereby Jacob's personal following in contrast with the **מנחה** which passed over in advance. And here it would be more natural to use the singular even though this camp was a double one.

Certainly neither of the above arguments, nor both together, can be considered as establishing authorship by E as against any considerable evidence for J. Let us see what there is to be urged on this side. Be it first observed that whether 14b-22 be J's or E's, in neither case does this passage form the parallel to vs. 4-9; for xxxiii. 8, which certainly refers to and must be connected with, xxxii. 14b-22, requires us to assume that this "company" which Esau "met" was not a first embassy, but a second one. Otherwise we must suppose that Esau was already *en route* without having received any notice of Jacob's arrival. Still more plainly it appears from ver. 18 that Jacob knows Esau to be *en route*, for the servants are given instructions for "when Esau meeteth thee." We must understand this to be a reference to ver. 7 or else supply the equivalent. Again xxxiii. 10 and 11 are certainly doublets, from which it appears that both J and E related the sending the one a **מנחה** the other a **ברכה** to Esau. If then we separate xxxii. 14b sqq. from vs. 4-9 we find ourselves at best obliged to supply a first half of the

story to E and a second half to J. Dillmann points indeed to שְׂדֵה אֲדָם in ver. 4 as a relic of an E version of vs. 4-9, but as we are by no means obliged to suppose that E had any narrative of this first embassy these two words, which are readily explicable as a mere gloss to אֶרֶץ שְׂעִיר, or which might have come from quite a different connection, form a very inadequate foundation for any positive assumption. It clearly appears that there can be no argument here from duplication, for if 14b sqq. did not originally follow upon vs. 4-9 we are obliged to suppose that something of equivalent meaning did. So far then as appears from the story in ch. xxxii. it might equally well be J's or E's version of the sending of a present to Esau which is preserved to us in xxxii. 14b sqq.

But let us turn to xxxiii. 8-10. Here we have most undeniably a play upon the name Peniel, just as in xxxii. 4-9 upon Mahanaim. To the author's mind the traditional interpretation of the clause, "as one seeth the face of God," i. e., *tam benignam*, an interpretation which even Dillmann adopts, is an absurdity. The point of the comparison to which all of xxxii. 14b-22 and xxxiii. 8 sq. has been leading up is that as the worshipper "before God" presents his מִנְחָה and is accepted (Gen. iv. 2-7) so Jacob seeks to "appease" Esau "with the מִנְחָה which goeth before him; afterwards he will see his face and peradventure will be accepted" (xxxii. 21). Hence he can say when the result has followed his expectation. "If now I have found grace in thy sight then receive my מִנְחָה at my hand; forasmuch as I have seen thy face as one seeth the face of God (cf. Ex. xxxiv. 20b) and thou wast pleased with me." The connection of xxxiii. 8-10 with the whole passage descriptive of the מִנְחָה and above all with xxxii. 21 is absolutely undeniable. Dillmann even, who assigns xxxii. 14b sqq. to E, attempts to separate ver. 21, explaining it as inserted by R from J, but the verse cannot be disconnected from the context. Throughout xxxii. 8 sq., 14-22; xxxiii. 1-3, 6-10 there is the same underlying idea, the shrewd disposition of Jacob's forces in view of the 400 men.

On the other hand, much as it may interfere with the smoothness of analysis, the linguistic and stylistic marks of xxxiii. 8-10 are too strong to be ignored. Dillmann is certainly right in insisting that none but J could have written twice here מִצָּא חֵן and once כִּי עַל כֵּן, and we might now add that it is J who speaks of the divisions of Jacob's retinue as מַחֲנֹת, xxxii. 4-9, 22; xxxiii. 8, and J who speaks of the present as a מִנְחָה (cf. ver. 11, בְּרִכָּה). Moreover ver. 11, unless we abstract from it the middle clause without reason, must certainly be E's (cf. ver. 5 and אֱלֹהִים), and this compels us to assign its manifest doublet, ver. 10, to J. I see no escape from the conclusion that xxxii. 14b-22; xxxiii. 8-10 are J's as well as xxxii. 4-9.

Turning now again to xxxii. 14b sqq. and critically examining the language we find indeed nothing decisive either way, yet all the peculiarities which do appear favor the authorship of J. מִנְחָה, vs. 14b and 20, must be contrasted



with **ברכה**, xxxiii. 11. **תישים**, ver. 15, is found only in J, Gen. xxx. 35, and **רחלים** in the same verse only in J, Gen. xxxi. 38. The words may be considered characteristic although here unavoidable terms, in the sense that J displays a greater interest than E in the shepherd's art and shepherd scenes, and greater familiarity with shepherds' terms. **צדר**, vs. 17 and 20 (four times), is found only in J, Gen. xxix. 2 *bis*, 3, 8; xxx. 40; xxxv. 21 (E has **צאן**). **אולי**, ver. 21 (cf. Gen. xviii. 24, 28; xxiv. 5, 39; xxvii. 12; xliii. 12); **נשא פנים**, ver. 21 (cf. Gen. xix. 21 (iv. 7?)); **גם הוא**, ver. 19 (cf. Gen. iii. 6; iv. 22, 26; x. 21, etc.); **מחנה**, ver. 22 (cf. ver. 8 sq.; xxxiii. 8); are also worthy of note.

From the above analysis it appears that JE presented in his narrative of the meeting and reconciliation of Jacob and Esau only the merest traces and fragments of E, and this no doubt corresponds to the original proportions of E's account relatively to J's. We have no right to assume that E presented a duplicate of everything in J, but must supply the gaps as briefly as is consistent with subsequent references in E's narrative. Acting on this principle we gather from xxxiii. 11 that Jacob had sent a gift (**ברכה**) to Esau, "to the field of Edom," accompanied perhaps with a message like Gen. L. 17, and that Esau had therefore come to meet him. Further assumptions are gratuitous.

In ver. 23 sq. we have two contradictory statements, one that Jacob "passed over the ford of Jabbok," and one that he remained behind, but sent over his retinue. The latter stands connected with the story of the nightly wrestling. Ver. 23, on account of **שפחות** and because J alone (ver. 7 sq.) furnishes a motive for a crossing at night, must be assigned, at least in part, to J, and Dillmann reasons that because the clause, "and passed over the ford of Jabbok," stands connected with this verse and not with ver. 24a it must be J who brings Jacob to the southern bank at this point and consequently leaves no room for the story of the wrestling, for this is certainly enacted on the *northern* shore (cf. ver. 24 sq.). But this reasoning is not conclusive; for the datum, "and he passed over the ford of Jabbok," is all that is introduced into the *Hauptbericht* from the parallel source, **ויקחם** being a mere resumption by JE<sup>2</sup> of the thread of ver. 23. This datum had to be inserted here and could not be inserted in ver. 24 since Jacob could not then have been "left alone" (ver. 25). In other words, if JE<sup>2</sup> had before him the parallels,

J.

And he took his two wives, etc., and sent them over the stream.

E.

[And he took his household (?)] and [he] passed over the ford of Jabbok.

he was obliged, in order to connect with ver. 25, to put first the item, "and passed over the ford of Jabbok," and afterward the item, "and sent them over the stream," whether they stood as above in the originals or *vice versa*.

If now "Jordan" in ver. 11 be original with J, it appears highly improbable that the name Jabbok should have occurred in the same document immediately

after. The present writer, however, rejecting ver. 11, cannot of course lay stress upon this point. Whether J had originally the clause, "and passed over the ford of Jabbok," or "and sent them over," etc., must depend upon whether ver. 25 is assigned to E or J.

It may seem as if E's authorship of vs. 25-32 was conclusively established by the assignment of xxxiii. 8-10 to J, for the author is not of those who believe that the two aetiologies of Peniel in xxxii. 31 and xxxiii. 10 can both be assigned to the same document. I am indebted to Prof. G. F. Moore, of Andover, for the suggestion that ver. 31 is perhaps separable from its present context. Here in fact is to be found in my opinion the solution of the many difficulties with which the analysis of chs. xxxii. sq. is surrounded.

Nearly all critics (Dillmann excepted) feel compelled to assign vs. 25 sq. to J for reasons doubtless familiar to the reader. Of these, however, the most important is the fact that it is J, not E, who from this point on (changes of R in view of xxxv. 9 sq. excepted) adopts the name Israel.

Apparently ver. 31 stands very closely related to the context, although it might be questioned whether "I have *seen* God" was a suitable expression to describe the encounter just related. Certainly the stylistic form of the verse is E's (cf. for this elliptical form xli. 51 sq.; Ex. xviii. 4; cf. also ver. 3 and contrast xxxiii. 17), though פנים אל פנים (Ex. xxxiii. 7) cannot in the author's view be cited in favor of E. But the fatal objection to regarding the verse as standing in its original context here is that the scene of the encounter is certainly Mahanaim on the northern bank of the Jabbok, and not Peniel on the southern. Cf. xxxii. 23 sq.; xxxiii. 10. The encounter of vs. 25-30 then is not so much a parallel, as suggested by Wellhausen, to the meeting with Esau, but to the meeting with the angels of God at Mahanaim, vs. 1-3. It is not Peniel at all that the author has in mind originally, but the word-play is upon *Jabbok* and *Israel*. The scene of vs. 25-30 is Mahanaim. In E's narrative of Peniel the meeting was doubtless some appearance of God to Jacob, assuring him of a peaceful reception by Esau (cf. xxxi. 24), from which all that now survives is ver. 31. The original context was perhaps quite similar to the present, though scarcely so anthropomorphic, but the scene of ver. 31 can only have been Peniel on the southern bank. Whether פנואל of ver. 32 in contrast with פניאל of ver. 31 can be taken as marking an original distinction of authorship is doubtful, but certainly there can be no good ground for attributing ver. 33 to R merely because it displays an unmistakable resemblance to J. The language and style of all the passage 25-33 *except* ver. 31 are also that of J. שחר, vs. 25 and 27, איש of the superhuman being, ver. 25, על-כן, ver. 33, are characteristic; the unwillingness of the elohim-being to be seen by day light (cf. ii. 21; xix. 15) and the resemblance of the story in its anthropomorphic conceptions to Ex. iv. 24-26 also speak for this author.

In ch. XXXIII. vs. 1-3,4a are universally recognized as J's on account of the 400 men (XXXII. 7) and שפחות. Vs. 4b,5 and 11 are with equal unanimity and for obvious reasons assigned to E, whose narrative accordingly must have been quite brief.

After the theophany at Peniel Jacob meets Esau, "who fell on his neck and kissed him." Esau inquires concerning the women and children (and the present?) and is prevailed upon by Jacob to accept his gift.

Verses 18-20 are now recognized as E's with the exception of נבאו מפרן ארם = R and with the addition of מצבה ויבן in ver. 20. The conjecture of Wellhausen (*Comp.*, p. 316) of שלם for שכם in v. 18 is attractive, but cf. XXVIII. 21, of which the narrative just ended of Jacob's meeting with Esau was the fulfillment.

With regard to ch. XXXIV., Cornill (*Zeitschr. f. Alt. Wiss.* XI. 1) seems to have uttered the last word of analytical criticism; but his argument for connecting XXXV. 14 with ver. 8 is not convincing. If the verse was obnoxious to R we can understand his omitting it but not his appending it to P's Bethel story. In fact it is hard to find a reason for its introduction into a Bethel story unless it originally referred to the *maggebah* at Bethel. The clause "In the place where he spake with him" is to be eliminated from ver. 13 (cf. XVII. 22) as dittographic, but not from this verse, since here it is required to locate the *maggebah*. The *maggebah* then memorialized not a grave (ver. 8) but a theophany. מצבת אבן is remarkable, but cannot possibly be assigned to R who makes it his business rather to obliterate than to define the *maggeboth*. (Cf. XXXIII. 20). But why should it be deemed inappropriate in J? This author alludes indeed but rarely to *maggeboth*; still there is reason to think his narrative does contain allusions to them (cf. XXXI. 25,49 E, Josh. IV. 3,8); J hence might naturally introduce such an explanatory clause. But in E it is scarcely conceivable. I incline to think rather with Kuenen that we have here the relic of J's account of the theophany at Bethel, upon which Hos. XII. 5 and the narrative of P, XXXV. 9sq. are based, and from which the J elements of XXVII. 11sq. were taken. The narrative then stood originally at this place and comprised XXVIII. 13sq., 16, then XXXV. 14; XXVIII. 19.

The JE verses which follow, viz., 16-18, I judge to be from the same source and connection. "And they journeyed from Bethel" does not stand very well so directly after the command in ver. 1 (E) "Go up to Bethel and dwell (ישב) there." Ver. 17 seems to refer quite pointedly to xxx. 24 (J). We know from XXXIII. 2 and other passages that J must have related the birth of Benjamin after Jacob's return. We do not know this of E, but on the contrary P, vs. 25sq., describes it as taking place in Paddan-Aram. If P had any authority for this statement it can only have been E. This would, of course, exclude vs. 16-18



from this author. Vs. 19sq. on the contrary, are certainly E's (cf. "Jacob" with "Israel," v. 21, and the **מַצְבֵּה**) but these verses may at least equally well be regarded as parallel to 16-19 (cf. **וּמָתָה** ver. 9) Vs. 21sq. are of course to be assigned to J with all critics. We may then perhaps assume that J alone brought Israel on his journey toward the south, E regarding Bethel as his dwelling-place (cf. "Dothan" xxxvii. 17), J locating it at Hebron (xxxvii. 14).

In ch. xxxvii. a proper division of the material avoids all difficulty in the analysis. Vs. 12,13a must be J's on account of "Israel;" 13b from **וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ הֲנִי** and 14a should be assigned to E on account of the expression just quoted (cf. xxii. 1,7,11, etc.); 14b then joins without break upon 13a and ver. 18 follows with only the subject "his brethren" to be supplied in place of "they." Vs. 15-17 on the other hand follow just as naturally upon 14a, though perhaps we should supply **וַיִּשְׁלַחְהוּ** or the equivalent. The verses explain how Joseph comes to be so far from home as to be beyond help even when Reuben desires to restore him to his father. He was not originally expected to go far from home (Bethel?) but not finding his brethren in the vicinity he is directed to the comparatively distant Dothan. In J he is expected originally to go to a much greater distance.

The first clause of ver. 25 is essential to the story of E, for it explains how Joseph could be "stolen away" (xl. 15) by the Midianites without the knowledge of Reuben (ver. 29) or the brethren. While they are occupied with their noonday meal the Midianite merchantmen pass by unobserved, and hearing Joseph's cries take him off to Egypt.

There is no reason to suppose that the "pit" appeared at all in J's version. Judah interferes (ver. 21) with the plot of the brethren against Joseph, "delivers him out of their hand" protesting against their cruelty. While thus engaged in dispute they see a passing company of Ishmaelites and compromise by selling him into slavery. The explanatory clause in ver. 23 **אֶת-כְּתֹנֶת הַפָּסִים אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו** may be redactional or a fragment of J; but in neither case need the perfect continuity of E in vs. 10sq.,22-25a,28a (to **הַבּוֹר**), be interrupted. The presence of **וַיַּעַל** in ver. 28 alongside of **וַיִּמְשְׁכוּ** is not a sufficient reason for assuming a parallel in J.

In ver. 32sq. **וַיִּשְׁלַחוּ אֶת-כְּתֹנֶת הַפָּסִים** and **טָרַף טָרַף יֶסֶף** are from J, the latter being a duplicate of the first part of the verse; this can only be E's, on account of ver. 20, while **טָרַף וּגֹר** must be J's on account of xliv. 28. With the exception of **וַיִּמְכְּרוּ אֶת-יוֹסֵף לִישְׁמַעֲעִיל בְּעִשְׂרִים כֶּשֶׁף** in ver. 28, of these two clauses in 32sq. and of ver. 34, vs. 28-36 are exclusively from E.

Few chapters afford so perfect an example as this of an analysis of JE to be carried through on really conclusive evidence. It is a pity to introduce confusion by a misplaced clause or two.

Gen. xli. 30-xlii. 7 affords a very difficult problem to the analysis. There does not indeed seem to be adequate reason for dividing the two dreams of Pharaoh, of the cattle and the ears of corn, to J and E respectively. E has in chs. xxxvii. and xl. in each case a pair of dreams, and unless we are prepared to discard as redactional vs. 25sq. and 32 we must admit that this was here also the case. The middle clause of ver. 14, which presupposes J's form of the narrative (ch. xxxix.), is, of course from J; and it is possible that here and there a word may have been taken by JE<sup>2</sup> from the parallel narrative which J doubtless afforded. Otherwise in vs. 1-30 I see no reason to suspect the presence of J. Ver. 31, however, is almost certainly a doublet of ver. 30, and כּבֶּד is characteristic of J (cf. xii. 10; xliii. 1; xlvii. 4, 13). Vs. 32sq. again are certainly from E (cf. xxii. 8), and the latter verse carries with it ver. 39 (cf. נֶבֶן וְחָקֵם ver. 33 and 39).

In 34sq. we begin to meet real perplexities. The first clause of v. 34 has no relation to the rest of the verse, and the three consecutive וַיֹּאמֶר פֶּ' אֶל יֹסֵף in vs. 39, 41, 44 can scarcely be original. The best clew for analysis which I have been able to find is xlvii. 13sq. (certainly J's) where a sentiment in decided contrast to the humane feeling of v. 36 comes into very plain view. To the author of xlvii. 13sq. the famine of the unfortunate peasants is purely an opportunity for the aggrandizement of Joseph and Pharaoh at their expense. His interest centers not at all in the "great deliverance" by which "much people are saved alive," xlv. 5b, 7; L. 20 (E), but in the shrewd corner in wheat effected by Joseph and Pharaoh, where Pharaoh furnishes the capital and Joseph the foresight. Through this combination a decidedly Jewish bargain is driven with the starving people. Vs. 35a, 36, according to this view, would belong to E; and ver. 35bc which is the statement of a plan for getting the crops under Pharaoh's control, and for keeping it "in the cities" whither in fact we find Joseph removing the people in xlvii. 21 when the famine comes on, must be J's. It seems in fact to be J who is impressed with the phenomenon of the congestion of the population of Egypt in the cities and the despotic landlord system. Again the tax of the fifth part in ver. 34 is conceived as a special rate enacted temporarily in years of extraordinary yield, to meet an imminent public danger. But in xlvii. 24 the "fifth" is a permanent tax, imposed in perpetuity after the years of plenty and famine are over, and not apparently regarded by the people as excessive (xlvii. 25). The difference is no doubt reconcilable, but makes the assignment of ver. 34 (except first clause) to E, more probable. After the יֵעֵשׂ פֶּרְעָה (=J) we should probably supply the word now apparently corrupted in v. 56, which LXX. render *σιτοβολῶνες* and the revisers "storehouses." In place of ver. 36 should be perhaps some outline of the plan followed in xlvii. 13sq.

Ver. 37 might belong to either document, but ver. 38 is to be assigned to E on account of the prophetic character attributed to Joseph and the connection with

ver. 33, and this verse may carry the preceding with it. Vs. 39sq. are from the same writer (cf. v. 33 and observe **אָהֲרִי** instead of **כִּי-עַל-כֵּן** רַק, ver. 40, although more frequent in J occurring also in E, Gen. xx. 11. Vs. 41-44 are manifestly parallel to 38-40, still we have twice consecutively **וַיֹּאמֶר פ' אֵל יִסָּף**, but there is not the same objection to assigning both of these to the same document as in the case of vs. 38 and 41, since here Pharaoh's address is interrupted by the relation of a number of actions. **נָתַתִּי אֶתְךָ** might be cited in favor of identity of vs. 41 and 43 with ver. 33, but the expression is the most natural one for J to adopt as well as E, for the expression of his thought; and the resemblance of this expression is more than outweighed by the word connected with it, **רָאָה**, which occurs nowhere in E, but in J repeatedly; cf. Gen. xxvii. 27; xxxi. 50; Ex. xxxiii. 13. Again it is in J that Joseph is made to "run" from the dungeon into Pharaoh's presence and the transformation of his dress and personal appearance has therefore more significance in this narrative. Finally it is J, never E, who take a special interest in priests and priestly connections for his characters. (Cf. ver. 45 [J]; xlvii. 22,26; Ex. ii. 16sq.; xix. 22,24.) The garment of byssus with which Joseph is clothed is a *priestly* garment.

Ver. 44 follows better, as has been shown, after 43 than after 39sq. and its hyperbolic figure is quite characteristic of J (cf. Ex. x. 26; xi. 7). Ver. 45 must be J's as the mention of an alliance of this kind is highly improbable in P and the variants Potiphar (E, xxxvii. 36) and Potipherah can scarcely have stood for different persons in the same writing. Ver. 45c seems to connect itself with the narrative of P which here (in 46a) comes in with its usual data of age. Ver. 45c is in any case parallel to 46b which has the phraseology of J. Ver. 46b in turn connects immediately with ver. 48, where the plan of collecting food "in the cities" is followed, which appears also in v. 35 and xlvii. 21 (J). Ver. 47 thus falls into place in the narrative of E after ver. 40, and it does not appear that anything is missing. Ver. 49 affords difficulty as **חָדָל** speaks strongly for J; but the verse itself seems to be a doublet of 48 and the expression "as the sand on the seashore" is more characteristic of E. (Cf. I Kgs. iv. 20,29 E, with Gen. xiii. 16; xxviii. 14, J). On the whole the verse (or a part?) may better be assigned to E; likewise 50a, 51-53 on account of **אֱלֹהִים**. Ver. 54a stands connected with 55,56sq. where the thought stands in strange contrast with 54b, this latter regarding the plenty of the people as Joseph's triumph, and vs. 54a,55,56b, making their necessity his opportunity. In the portions omitted in the extrication of this J element, viz., vs. 53,54b,56a,57 = E, the contrast is between all other countries and Egypt. In J the contrast is between the helpless distress of the starving people and Joseph's overflowing granaries. We are not informed of the condition of other countries until xlii. 5; xlvii. 13-15, where we learn—quite unnecessarily if xli. 54b,56a,57 have already stated the case—that the famine extended to Canaan as well as Egypt.



In XLI. 30-57 we have therefore a tolerably complete narrative in each of the prophetic documents. In XLII. 1-7 we have again only fragments of J, apparently because of the close similarity of the two sources at this point. The superfluous **וַיֹּאמֶר** of ver. 2; ver. 4b (cf. ver. 38 and XLIV. 29); ver. 5 (cf. "Israel" with "Jacob" in vs. 1-4); the middle clause of ver. 6 (Joseph as corn-dealer, cf. XLI. 56, rather than governor of the land), and ver. 7 (except the clause "and spake roughly to them," displaced from ver. 9; cf. ver. 30 sq., E, with XLIII. 7; XLIV. 18 sq., J) are the only traces of J suggested; but these suffice to give the substance of the subordinate source. The writer acknowledges a disposition to overlook the **וַיֹּאמֶר** of ver. 2 as insignificant, and to consider 4b an explanatory gloss derived from ver. 38, ver. 5 being the real beginning of J's narrative. The absence of Benjamin requires no special explanation after xxxv. 16 sqq. (cf. XLIV. 20) and ver. 5b gives the occasion of the brother's visit in a way that seems to exclude any other, 5a joining directly upon XLI. 56. Ver. 11a may also be a trace of the conversation referred to by XLIII. 3 sqq. and XLIV. 18 sqq., as it seems to be a doublet (cf. ver. 13) and to be excluded by the report of ver. 31 sq. The contrast in conception of J and E in this passage is accordingly: In J, the famine invading Canaan the sons of Israel come among the rest of Joseph's customers. He knows them, but contents himself with friendly inquiries; finally, however, insisting as a condition of further purchases that they shall bring Benjamin. In E, all countries except Egypt being famine-stricken, Jacob despatches the ten brethren to Egypt to "the governor of the land," who is Joseph, to obtain permission "to traffic in the land" (ver. 34). In the presence of the governor they prostrate themselves, which recalls to Joseph his dreams (xxxvii. 6-10); he accuses them and treats them as spies, but finally releases all but Simeon, who remains a hostage for the bringing of Benjamin.

---

The passage XLVII. 13-26 is generally ascribed to J, "with traces of E." I have been unable to discover any trace of E, but on the contrary am at a loss to perceive any reason for doubting the unity of the section. In vs. 13-15 the seat of the famine is "Egypt and Canaan" as in J in XLI. sq. and ver. 4, not "all the earth" as in E, XLI. 54b, 56a, 57. Joseph is the dealer in grain personally, as in XLII. 6. The people of Egypt are starving, contrary to E's representation, XLV. 18 sqq. The priests are favored, and in ver. 26 an antiquarian interest appears as the occasion for the narrative. Cf. II. 24; xxxii. 33.

The language bears the plainest marks of J, **כָּבֵד**, ver. 13; **הַנִּמְצָא**, 14; **חֲמֹר**, 15, 18, *horses*, 17; **קָעָה**, 21; and **יָדוּת**, ver. 24, are considered by Dillmann characteristic. **מִקְנֵה הַצֹּאן וּמִקְנֵה הַבָּקָר**, ver. 17, is found only in J, Gen. xxvi. 14. **נָהַל** *ibid.* only in Gen. xxxiii. 14. Ver. 21b recalls xix. 4.

גבול מצרים is characteristic of J (cf. Ex. vii. 27; x. 14,19). רקן, vs. 22,26, is much more frequent in J than in E. מצא חן בעיני, ver. 25, occurs in J *passim*, in E nowhere. The mere occurrence of חזק, ver. 20, after כבר, ver. 13, is entirely without weight against such an array.

In other chapters of Gen. xxxii.-L. the analysis of the present writer does not substantially differ from that of Kautzsch and Socin.

## ANNEXION IN ASSYRIAN.

BY CHARLES F. KENT, PH. D.,

Berlin, Germany.

---

In Assyrian, as in every newly discovered literature, the time and attention of scholars has hitherto been chiefly devoted to an etymological study of the language. This has borne its fruits and now we are able to read the inscriptions with comparative ease and certainty. The recent valuable publications of texts have made the more important annals accessible to all. However, before the literature can be rightly estimated as such, the grammar of the language must be scientifically studied. Thus far no conclusive or exhaustive work has been done along this line. Prof. Delitzsch, in his recent *Assyrian Grammar*, claims only to present the latest results of research. With many of his conjectural conclusions, in view of the facts of the language, it will be found necessary radically to disagree.

Under the direction of Prof. William R. Harper and Dr. Robert Francis Harper, an attempt has been made by three or four of the graduate students of Yale to make a thorough study of some of the leading grammatical questions in Assyrian. To avoid the errors incidental to a merely cursory investigation, every case under each form occurring in the leading inscriptions of a certain period has been collected as a basis for inductions.\* This makes it possible to treat each point historically and to note its growth, and thus assign each new development to its true position. This knowledge of the order of historical development in turn enables the students to determine the characteristics of each inscription and to ascertain what forms or usages are most prominent in any given period.

The following inductions are based upon a two-fold classification of the examples of annexion (with the first member phonetically written) occurring in the historical inscriptions found in Volumes I. and II. of Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. Though it has been found necessary constantly to correct the transliteration from the original cuneiform, yet this has proved the most convenient basis of work and reference. The first classification is based upon the form assumed by the first and second members of the annexion, and it includes the cases of ša employed to indicate the construct relation; the second upon the syntactical

---

\* Since the beginning of this study, works on Greek grammar, based on the same methods of investigation have appeared indicating that the classicists are beginning to appreciate the need and value of such conclusive work.



force thus expressed. In addition to these, all peculiar forms and cases are collated under a special classification. This work has been supplemented by a discussion of doubtful cases in the class-room.

I. FORMS EMPLOYED TO EXPRESS ANNEXION.—A. THE FIRST MEMBER ENDING IN *i*.

That there was a primitive Semitic noun declension with a nominative in *u*, a genitive in *i*, and an accusative in *a* is now generally admitted. That this is retained in Assyrian, although with an infinite variety of exceptions, appears also to be true.\* The Arabic not only retains these case-endings in the absolute, but also regularly with the first member of the construct. Accepting these premises, the early history of the form is clear. It is the remnant of the primitive Semitic genitive ending frequently retained in the construct after the analogy of the Arabic.

The use of the first member in *i*:

1) As to case—historical development—two questions immediately arise. (1) Is the *i* retained with the first member only when it stands in the genitive? (2) If not, are there any indications of such a restricted use in the early Assyrian? The following table based on the total number of cases of the first member in *i* answers these questions:

TABLE I.

	Genitive.	Nomina- tive.	Accusa- tive.	Total Nom. and Acc.	Totals.
First member in Oldest					
Inscriptions.....	8	3	..	3	11
Tiglath-pileser.....	16	1	13	14	30
Ašûrnâsirpal.....	60	12	20	32	92
Shalmaneser IV.....	50	11	16	27	77
Šamši-Rammân.....	14	5	2	7	21
	148			83	
Tiglath-pileser III.....	15	2	8	10	25
Sargon.....	27	10	25	35	62
Sennacherib.....	22	4	23	27	49
Esarhaddon.....	23	1	7	8	31
Ašûrbânipal.....	42	6	18	24	66
	129			104	

\* Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gram.*, § 66.

From the above table it is evident (1) that the use of *i* with the first member is by no means confined to the cases in which this stands in the genitive. But (2) there are plain indications of a tendency to employ this form in the earlier inscriptions more commonly when this first member is in the genitive than when in the nominative and accusative. Combining the results in Table I, the total number of cases in which *i* is employed in the genitive in the inscriptions of the old Assyrian kingdom is 148; in other cases (nominative and accusative), 83. In the new Assyrian kingdom the total of the genitives is 129; other cases, 104. Comparing these totals, we see that in the first kingdom the ratio is about seven to four, while in the latter it is about six to five. If only a few inscriptions were thus compared the value of the results might be questioned; but being based on such a large number of cases (464) they are thus raised above the caprice of one author or subject, and any induction based upon them must be considered reasonably reliable. Although it may seem at first glance that the difference in the ratio is small, still when the large number of cases, in which the form absolutely demands the first member with final *i*, has been studied the variation will appear the more remarkable.

Referring again to the table, we observe that in the oldest inscriptions only three out of the eleven examples in *i* are not in the genitive. In TP. I. there is a marked increase due in part to the recurrence in the accusative of *libbi* (which necessarily takes *i*) as the first member. In Ašurn., Shalm. II. and Šamši-Rammân, *i* with the genitive is nearly twice as common as with all other cases.

From the above facts the inferences can fairly be drawn (1) that this *i* is a remnant of the primitive genitive case-ending; (2) that in the earlier inscriptions a memory of this primitive use remains; but (3) that at an early period this lost, to a large extent, its original force as the sign of the genitive; and hence is the vowel which appears most commonly as the final vowel of the first member, when one is necessarily required. By this early transference to other cases, *i* appears to have secured the priority of possession so that, next to those in which the final vowel of the first member is elided, these cases are most frequent in the inscriptions. (4) That in the later inscriptions *i* is employed quite irrespective of the case of the first member. The ratio which exists between the examples of *i* with a first member in the genitive or in the nominative or accusative, I should say from general observation, represents the usual ratio between the frequency of occurrence of these cases in the absolute; and hence we are not justified in saying that *i* is still employed oftener in the genitive because of the influence of that case.

## 2) Used interchangeably with other parallel forms.

The interchangeable use of exactly parallel forms, as far as noun-root and meaning is concerned, throws much light upon the freedom in the choice of the ending of the first member.

(a) Variants. Ašurn. II. 118 *ana tu-ru gimilli or ana tu-ri gi milli*; Senn. II. A, *ina kirbi maḥâzi*. B, *ina kirib maḥâzi*.

(b) Parallel phrases. Ašurn. II. 23, *ina limi Ašûrdin*; Shalm. I. 45, *ina limu Dâṇ-Ašûr*; Shalm. I. 27, *ša šulmi šamši*; TP. VI. 44, *ša šalamu šamši*; Shalm. Mon. I. 13, *bêlûti naḫar mâtâtî*; Sarg. 2, 45, *bêlût Aššûr*; Šam. Ram III. 8, *tibi taḥâziia*; TP. III. 18, *tib taḥâziia*; Sarg. 3, 135, *ma-a-ti (amelu) Lulî*; Sarg. 2, 39, *ma-at Aššûr*.

Three words, used in the first member, are found with both *i* and *u* retained; twenty with *i* or the final vowel elided. Further, two forms of the same word are found in the same inscription. From these facts it is to be inferred (1) that, while in the great majority of words the construct singular form has become fixed, yet in these few cases there is a wavering between the form with the final vowel elided and that with *i* or *u* retained; (2) that all forms conveyed the same shade of meaning and were considered equally correct; (3) that, therefore, in the case of these twenty-three words the form appearing depended upon the style or choice of the different scribes.

3) First member in *i*: when employed. From the preceding discussion it has appeared that there are certain cases in which the use of *i* depends upon the choice of the author. Is this the only reason or are there regular laws governing its use?

From a study of the cases found in the inscriptions, it appears that *i* is commonly found as the final vowel of the first member:

(a) When the first member is derived from a root whose third radical is weak, nominative in *û*. Ašurn. I. 31, *ina pi-i ilâni*; Shalm. II. *naši ḫatti*; Sarg. 2, 6, *li' kâl malki*; Esarh. A. III. 49, *na-gi-i (mâtu) Bâzi*; Ašurb. VIII. 26, *ina ma-li-i libbâti*. This is the only reason suggested by Prof. Delitzsch in his *Assyrian Grammar*\* for the appearance of *i*. As a matter of fact this explains but a small proportion of the total number of cases. Tig.-Pil. VII. 50, *na-aš ḫatti* might be cited as an exception to the rule, but, with a few exceptions, it is practically universal.

(b) When a final vowel is necessarily retained, or otherwise two consonants would stand at the end of a word (which is contrary to Assyrian usage).

(1) Feminine and abstract nouns formed by the addition of the affix *tu* directly to the stem.† Tig.-Pil. I. 10, *ina tukulti Ašûr*; IV. 89, *šakalti ummânâtîšu*; Sarg. 3, 95, *šalipti bêlusu*; Senn. IV. 21, *si-it-ti nišê*; Esarh. A. VI. 3, *siḫirti êkali*.

(2) Final radical reduplicated.

\* §72.

† Cf. Müller, *Grammatische Bemerkungen zu den Annalen Asurnasirpal*, ZA. I. 4, 358.



Tig.-Pil. IV. 36, *našaddi Ašûr*; VI. 93, *libbi ilûtišunu*; Ašurn. I. 26, *melamme bêlûtišu*; Šam. Ram. I. 8, *allalli ilâni*; Sarg. 3, 118, *turri gimillišu*.

This cause explains nearly half (186 out of a total of 364) of the cases in *i*.

The appearance of *i* instead of *u* or *a* in these instances in which a vowel is required must be regarded as one of the facts of the language, which in turn may be due to the early transference of *i* as the final vowel of the first member in other cases than the genitive, or to the attraction of a preceding or following *i*. It must be placed side by side with the preference shown for the genitive ending outside of the construct.

(c) Final *i* attracted by a preceding *i* and retained for the sake of euphony. Tig.-Pil. VI. 41, *šidi ħuršâni*; Šam. Ram. III. 8, *tibi taḥâziia*; Sarg. 2, 68, *zikri abulli*; Senn. II. 11, *gimri mâtišu*; Ašurb. I. 31, *nirmiki Nabû*; I. 84, *namriri Ašûr u Ištar*.

Unfortunately the subject of euphony in Assyrian has not received any careful or scientific study. But judging from the results which have already been obtained from this source in explaining etymological changes, it is reasonable to predict that it will prove a valuable field of research. In Hebrew this principle exercises an important influence, especially in determining verbal forms. The presence of a large number of onomatopoeic words in the Semitic languages is an index pointing in the same direction. In view of these and other considerations, we have reasonable cause to anticipate the influence of euphonic principles in regulating the ending of the first member.

From the phonetic law discovered by Professor Haupt,\* it appears, that *â* or *a* is changed to *e* or *i* after a preceding *i* or *e* or with a following *i*. With this must be compared the insertion of a similar vowel when segholate nouns stand in the first member of an annexion. From *kalbu*, *kalab*; from *kirbu*, *kirib*; from *šulmu*, *šulum*. The underlying principle in each case seems to be that of similarity, i. e., to have a vowel of a word preceded or followed by a similar vowel wherever this is possible. It is reasonably certain that this principle explains the presence of *i* in the cases under consideration. Add the illustrations of this same case under *u* and *a* which will be studied later and the evidence is conclusive.

(d) When the first number is in the genitive. Šam. Ram. I. 5, *bâni bît Ašûr*; Tig.-Pil. V. 48, *ina tarši (m) Suḥi*; Ašurn. Mon. 83, *ina šarrûti pânišu*; Shalm. 27, *ša šulmi Šamši*.

That the *i* of the first number still bears some relation to its primitive use as the sign of the genitive, at least in the inscriptions of the old Assyrian kingdom, has already been shown. And even if the *i* of the genitive has largely lost its

\* Presented by Prof. Delitzsch in his *Assyrian Grammar*, § 32-34.

significance in annexion, the fact that to a certain extent it still retains its original force in other constructions cannot fail sometimes to make its influence felt in determining the ending of the first member. Therefore, it is not surprising to find a few cases in which the presence of *i* is explicable only for the reason that the first member is in the genitive. The retention of *i* can often be explained by more than one cause. For example Tig.-Pil. I. 13, *rišti (gen.) ilâni*. The *i* may be retained in accordance with the euphonic principle of similarity, because it is added to the nominal stem or because the first member is in the genitive. It is not improbable that the union of two or more causes led to the use of *i*.

Unexplained cases.

Ašurn. I. 80, *pulḥi melamme*; Shalm. 71, *tanâti Ašûr*; Shalm. Mon. II. 68 *nabli mulmuli*; Ašurb. IV. 35, *ḡurdi ilâni*.

(1) *Pulḥi melamme*. Why does this frequently recurring phrase always employ *pulḥi* instead of the corresponding *puluḥ*? It might be said that the phrase has become petrified. This is very probably the case; but, I think, that we can go back of this and find the cause in the principle of euphony. The phrase has become stereotyped, expressing an idea of terror and greatness in which the sound plays a very important part. There is a rhythmic sound in this form which is absent in *puluḥ melamme*. The following *i*'s or *e*'s not improbably exert an influence in retaining the *i* of the first number. (2) So also the principle of rhythm may explain the phrase *nabli mulmuli* (both words ending in *li*). (3) *Tanâti Ašûr* is doubtless for the regular form *tanatti*, which is classified under (b) (1). (4) *Ḡurdi ilâni* has a parallel form *ḡarrad*.

Thus we see that of the 464 cases of the first member retaining *i* only two or three examples cannot be explained by these four simple laws. Of these (a) and (b) are of all but universal application, while (c) and (d) depend in their use to a certain extent upon the particular phrase and the option or style of the author. Hence it may be said that in general the Assyrian exhibits a remarkable regularity in its use of this form of annexion.

In Hebrew, with the exception of the annexion contained in a few proper names which thus retain in petrified form the primitive usage, the cases, in which *i* is still retained with the first member in annexion, are all explained by (a) or (b) i. e. feminine nouns formed by the affixed **ת** or nouns whose third radical is weak.

גִּבְנֵי לֵילָה\*

מִלְאֲתִי מִשְׁפֹּט†

בְּנֵי אֲתָנָן‡

This is what would naturally be anticipated, for these laws are the most arbitrary. Thus the intermediate position which the Assyrian occupies between the Arabic and the Hebrew is indicated and the steps of development by which the latter has advanced made evident.

B. The first member in the singular ending in *u*.

\* Gen. 31:39.

† Isa. 1:21.

‡ Gen. 49:11.

Are these apparent cases of the first member ending in *u* properly constructs? Or are they only "cases of the careless omission of *ša*?" If so, we would expect to find *ša* generally inserted when the same phrases occur elsewhere. An actual comparison of all the cases in *u* and those with *ša* inserted demonstrates that in only one case out of the 113 is a parallel expression found with *ša* inserted; Ašurb. V. 115, *ina nagê ša Hunnir*, where as will be shown later, the form with *ša* is the more proper. Hence, plainly, the cases cannot be explained on the ground that *ša* is omitted, for under the same conditions all authors fail to insert it.

Is this, then, a careless writing for the more common forms with the final vowel elided or with *i* retained? Apparently favoring this view might be cited (a) variant readings and (b) parallel expressions in *u* and *i*, previously noted; (c) parallel expressions in *u* and the final vowel elided. Tig. Pil. VI. 44, *šalamu Šamši*; Ram. V. 30, *šulum šarrûtišu*; Shalm. I. 27, *šulme Šamši*; Ašurn. II. 118, *ana turu gimilli*; Shalm. I. 75, *ana tu-ur gimilli*; Sarg. 3, 188, *aššu turri gimilli*.

From these examples it might be urged that the author of the variant reading, appreciating the error of the form in *u*, corrects this; that the existence of the otherwise parallel expressions in *i*, or with final vowel elided, indicates that the form with *u* is an error of the scribe.

In answer to these claims the following arguments may be presented: (1) The large number of cases in *u* (113). Even though the Assyrian writers were very careless in their use of case-endings—a statement which the study of the cases in *i* did not support—it would be difficult to believe that such a large number of cases were mere errors. Furthermore it is to be noted that the forms with *u* occur in about the same proportion throughout the inscriptions, and hence are not the errors of one or two careless scribes. (2) Connected with this is the fact that certain phrases in *u*, as *ina limu*, *ina šurru*, run through all the inscriptions, thus indicating that there is a uniformity in their use and that it is not due to mere accident. (3) The examples cited to prove that they are exceptions or errors might be used equally as well to show that they are perfectly regular. The variants and parallel expressions indicate that both forms equally obtained; and that either could be employed as best conduced to the euphony or the choice of the author. As has been shown, the cases in *i* present an exact analogy. (4) The number of cases, in which these parallel expressions employ *u*, equals and sometimes exceeds those in which *i* or the form with final vowel elided appear. If the former were errors or exceptions they naturally would be much less common. (5) Finally the forms in *u* are employed in the same constructions with cases of annexion in which the final vowel of the first member is elided. Tig.-Pil. VIII. 39, *li-ta-at kurdiia irnintu tamhariia....altur*, *the might of my heroism and the victory of my battle....I inscribed*; Sarg. 3, 112, *lâ*



adir zikri ilâni kâpidu limneti dâbib galipti, *who did not fear the renown of the gods, who devised evil, who planned destruction.* Esarh. A. VI. 54, našir kibsi šarrûtiia muḥadû kabattiia, *protecting the footsteps of my majesty, causing my spirit to rejoice.*

As a result of these considerations, I would question the statement of Prof. Delitzsch,\* that the forms in *u* are exceptions to the general rule; and I must rather regard them as regular forms on a par with those in *i*. Like the latter, it is doubtless a remnant of the early Semitic nominal inflection, which still obtains side by side with the more common form of annexion, in which the final vowel of the first member is dropped. Hence its title to the field is good, which it still holds, although greatly encroached upon by the other forms.

2. Use of the first member in *u*. (1) As to case—historical development.

Does the first member take *u*, as in the Arabic, only when, by virtue of its construction, it is in the nominative case? If not, are there any indications of this primitive use? The following table presents the facts.

TABLE II.

First Member in	Nomina- tive.	Genitive.	Accusa- tive.	Total Gen. and Acc.	Total in <i>u</i> .
Tiglath-Pileser I.....	16	3	1	4	20
Ašûrnâširpal.....	16		3	3	19
Shalmaneser.....	10	1	1	2	12
Šamši-Rammân.....	1				1
	43			9	
Tiglath-Pileser III.....	2	1		1	3
Sargon.....	12	2	3	5	17
Sennacherib.....	7	1	7	8	15
Esarhaddon.....	7		4	4	11
Ašûrbânipal.....	5	3	7	10	15
	33			28	113

Consulting Table II. it appears that in the early inscriptions the cases in which *u* is employed with the first member in the nominative are far in the ascendancy. In course of time the lines approach each other, until in Sennacherib, *u* is used more frequently in the genitive and accusative than in the nominative. There is a slight reversal to earlier usage in Esarhaddon, but in Ašurbanipal the former is twice as common as the latter. Combining the results of Table II. it appears that

\* Gram., § 72, a, note.

in the inscriptions of the old Assyrian kingdom *u* was employed nearly five times as often, where the first member stood in the nominative, as in both the genitive and accusative, while in the new Assyrian kingdom the relative frequency is about the same. The evidence, therefore, is conclusive that in the early inscriptions the primitive case-usage of *u* was, with a certain degree of care, observed, but that in the later inscriptions it follows in the course of development, taken by the ending *i* much earlier, and came, at least, in the last inscription (Ašurbanipal) to be employed quite irrespective of the case of the first member. Such indications of development in turn point back to an original usage resembling that of the Arabic.

2. First member with final *u*—when employed. Classifying the examples it appears that *u* is retained.

(a) When the third radical is weak, nominative in *u*.

Tig.-Pil. I. 6, šaḫu-u namriri; Ašurn. I. 40, na-bu-u šumja; Šam. Ram. I. 27, rê'û ašrâti.

With but one exception (and that in a late inscription), these cases of *u* thus retained are in the nominative. Comparing this with previous results, it appears that sometimes in the nominative and regularly in other cases this *u* is changed to *i*. This rule explains a large proportion of the examples in *u*.

(b) When attracted by a preceding similar vowel, i. e., retained for the sake of euphony.

Tig.-Pil. I. 62, ina šurru šarrûtiia; Ram. N. 2, 7, ša šulmu šamši; Senn. III. 16, mithuşu zu-uk šipî; Esarh. A. IV. 25, puluhtu rašûbat Ašûr; Ašurb. I. 21, šarrûtu (m) Aššûr; IV. 68, limuttu pîšunu.

This principle explains more than half the cases in *u*. It confirms and, in turn, its validity is established, by the analogy of the examples in which *i* is retained in accord with the same law.

(c) Because the first member stands in the nominative.

Tig.-Pil. II. 38, pulḫu adiru melam Ašûr; IV. 41, šamšu gimir kâl šarrâni.

That the memory of the primitive use of *u* regularly with the nominative still exercised a considerable influence has been shown.

The presence of *u* (as in the case of *i*) may be explained in many instances by more than one of these principles. Very possibly it was their combined influence which finally resulted in the retention of *u* instead of some other more common form.

Of the total 113 cases, only six are not explained by these three simple principles. If the use of *u* with the first member is due merely to carelessness on the part of the scribes, we would surely expect to find many examples in which the retention of *u* was entirely arbitrary, and not explicable by any general principle of the language. This fact therefore confirms the statement that the form with *u*

is a regular means of indicating annexion. In Hebrew almost all traces of the primitive usage, of which the Arabic is the living representative, have disappeared. The few examples which do remain (as *חִיתוֹ אֶרֶץ*\* *מֵימֵינוּ*†) are however sufficient plainly to indicate that this language has passed through the same stage of development as the Assyrian.‡ Traces are even more common in the Phœnician proper names of this primitive use of *u* as the ending of the first member in annexion,‡ *מַעֲלַתּוּבַעַל*, *עֻזְרוּבַעַל*, *חֲרוּמַתִּים*.

(e) First member ending in *a*.

The following cases of the first member ending in *a* are found in the inscriptions.

Shalm. 165, Šam. Ram. II. 44, *ištu pana namurrat kakkija*; Tig.-Pil. III. 2, 13, *eli birina* (mat.) *Hilummi*; 2, 83, *ekallât* (pl.) *hudâti na-ša-a hegalli kariba šarri*; Sarg. 3, 143, Esarh. A. VI. 15, *kala rik-ki*; IV. 41, *mala libbi*.

It is a striking fact that out of the more than two thousand cases of annexion examined only six possible examples (representing a total of eight cases), take *a* with the first member.

In view of this fact we shall be obliged to modify the statement of Prof. Delitzsch§ that "it is an extremely common thing to find the first member retaining the case ending...*a* without *ša* appearing before the second member," and say that *a* as the final vowel of the first member is almost unknown.

No stronger proof that the Assyrian proceeded along definite lines in the development of the ending of the first member is needed than this practically total absence of examples of *a* retained by the first member. We have already seen how the Assyrian retained the genitive ending *i* very commonly and the nominative in *u* only less frequently; but the accusative ending in *a* appears early to have fallen into disuse. In this the Assyrian stands in direct antithesis with the Ethiopic,|| which latter retains only the *a* as the sign of the construct state. On the other hand, this usage binds the Assyrian by one more link to the Hebrew where all traces of this ending have disappeared except before certain pronominal suffixes.

D. First member retaining mimmation.

Esarh. A. II. 8, *ina iršitim* (m.) *Hubušna*; IV. 12, 23; Ašurb. IV. 85, *napištim* (amelu) *nakrûtiia*.

In the earlier inscriptions these are regular constructs with first member ending in *i*. Cf. Sarg. 348, *napišti mâtišunu*. In the later inscriptions, how-

\* Gen. 1:24.

† Ps. 114:8.

‡ Cf. Schröder, § 77. The long *u* in the examples probably comes from the lengthening of an originally short *u*.

§ *Assyr. Gram.*, § 72, note.

|| Cf. Phillippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des Status Constructus*, p. 153, Dillmann, 154, b, a.



ever, certain words, as *iršitim*, *damiḫtim*, *napištim* and *tâmtim*, appear to have retained this form on all occasions. Hence when these words stand as the first member in annexion, the mimmation is still retained.

It is to be noted that these examples with the first member with mimmation do not appear until Esarh. and Ašurb. and hence are characteristic of these late inscriptions.

E. First member retaining the full plural ending. By a line of proof somewhat similar to that followed with the singular ending *u* it might be demonstrated that the full plural ending is sometimes regularly retained. Assuming this let us endeavor to determine the reasons for this retention.

A study of the cases shows that the endings retained are :

(1) Masculine plural ending in *e* (often *i*). Tig.-Pil. III. 83, *ušši bît Anu*; Sarg. 3, 122, *a-di-e ilâni*; 3, 165, *da-ad-me mâtitân*.

These are by far the most common cases in which the plural ending is retained. This retention of *e* appears to be due to the same causes operative in the case of the singular ending *i*. (a) With nouns whose third radical is weak. (b) With nouns which otherwise would end in two consonants. The retention of this ending in an annexion must, therefore, be considered perfectly regular.

(2) Masculine plural in *-âni*, Sarg. 3, 9, *šarrâni limetišu*. These cases are very rare. In nine cases out of ten *ša* is inserted after this ending. No examples occur of the elision of the final vowel of this ending. In view of these facts, these cases must be regarded as exceptions.

(3) Plural in *u*. Tig.-Pil., III. 3, 7, *zu-u-ḫu šêpâ(?)*

(4) Plural in *-ûti*. Sarg. 2, 75, *ašibûti šame*; Ašurb. VI. 71, *la pâli-ḫûti Ašûr u Ištâr*.

(5) Feminine plural in *âti* (*ati*, *iti*). Shalm. Mon. II. 60, *epšeti irnin-tiia*; Šam. Ram. IV. 29, *šalmati ḫuradišunu*; IV. 25, *ana ummânâti mâtîia*.

The cases under (4) and (5) are rare compared with those with the first vowel elided. Even some of these examples have parallels with the latter form. While there are too many to be classed as errors yet they are the exception rather than the rule. Thus examples are found of all the plural endings retained except the rare *-a* and the doubtful *-ân*; but the ending *ê* is the only one which can be said to be regularly retained in annexion.

F. Final vowel of the first member dropped.

We are now ready to consider the law laid down by Prof. Delitzsch. "When with a noun in the singular, there is joined a substantive in the genitive (the so-called nexus of the construct state), the first member of the nexus drops the mimmation and also in the nominative and accusative the vowel of the case-ending . . . the *i* of the genitive of the first member is retained."\* Is this dropping of the

\* §72 *Assyr. Gram.*, a, 2, 1).

case-ending confined to the nominative and accusative, and is the *i* of the genitive always retained?

It has been shown that there is a gradual breaking away from the original use of *i* with the first member only when this is in the genitive; so that in the later inscriptions, it is used quite irrespective of the case. Hence since this use of *i* with the first member of the genitive is more common in the earlier inscriptions, the rule laid down by Prof. Delitzsch will hold true here if anywhere. That there may be sufficient data upon which to base a safe inference, I have taken Tig.-Pil., the largest of the earlier inscriptions. Of the one hundred cases in which the first member stands in the genitive singular, eighty-four drop the final vowel of the first member and only sixteen retain it, or less than one-fifth of the whole number. In view of these facts the error of Prof. Delitzsch's statement is apparent.

Although there are indications that in the earlier inscriptions the case still had some influence upon the ending of the first member, yet the instances really bear such a small proportion to the total number of cases of annexion that the general principle may be laid down that the final vowel of the first member is elided irrespective of case. Since the elision of the final vowel does not depend upon the case of the first member, the rule governing this must be sought elsewhere. A study of the cases shows that nouns constituting the first member fall under one of three divisions. (1) Those always eliding the final vowel. (2) Those sometimes retaining and sometimes eliding it. (3) Those which never drop the final vowel. Omitting the different classes of nouns which are included under each division and combining the results, it appears that the elision or retention of the final vowel of the first member depends, not upon its vowel formation, but upon the character of its third radical or the affix, if any, which is employed in its formation.

The final vowel of the first member is regularly elided (1) in the singular.  
(a) With masculine nouns whose third radical is strong, but not reduplicated. Tig.-Pil. I. 3, *gimir annunati*; IV. 14, *ziḱip patri*; Šam. Ram. IV. 25, *ḱitrub ummânâtija*.

(b) With feminine nouns formed by the affix *-ati*. Tig.-Pil. I. 37, *kibrat arba'i*; Shalm. I. 16, *kiššat niši*; Ašurb. IV. 99, (*ilu*) *šarrat kidmuri*.

(c) With abstract nouns formed by the affix *-ātu* (*âti*). Tig.-Pil. I. 21, *šarru-ut mâṭ Bêli*; Ašurb. I. 111, *tibu-ut Tarḱû*.

(d) With feminine nouns formed by the affix *-tu*, added to a root third radical weak. Šam. Ram. IV. 2, *ina birit ṣaddi*; Senn. VI. 64, *tarbit birkija*; Tig.-Pil. V. 54, *sitit ummânâtîšunu*.

(2) In the plural.

(a) With the ending *ātu* (*âti*). Tig.-Pil. VI. 85, *nakrût Ašûr*; Senn. VI. 30, *âlikût maḥri*.

(b) With the feminine ending *âti* (often attracted by a preceding *i* to *itu*, *iti*). Tig.-Pil. I. 8, *šalpat âbi*; Tig.-Pil. VII. 51, *epšet kâtišu*; Esarh. A. IV. 55, *šallat nakire*.

Of the above rules, (1), (b), (c) and (d) are practically universal in their application. To (1) (a) there are a few exceptions, especially those words which have parallel forms. Only 18 exceptions to (2) (b) and 8 to (2) (a) are found in the inscriptions. In view of the fact that both of these plural endings are very common, it is plain that the rule is all but universal.

A study of the cases in which the final vowel is dropped in turn confirms the conclusions reached respecting the cases in which the final vowel is retained. Combining these we see that the final vowel of the first member is retained (1) in the singular.

(a) Always with feminine nouns formed by adding *-tu* directly to the stem, provided the third radical is strong.

(b) Always with nouns whose final radical is re-duplicated.

(c) Generally with masculine nouns whose third radical is weak.

(2) In the plural.

(a) Always with *ê* (*î*).

(b) Always with *âni*.

The insertion of a short vowel before the final consonant of the first member. An examination of the cases makes it evident that this short vowel appears with but two classes of nouns.

(1) Nouns with but one short vowel, or segholates.

(a) With *a*, Tig.-Pil. III., 38, *ḳabal targigi*.

(b) With *i*, Ašurb. V. 40, *kirib (mātu) Êlamti*.

(c) With *u*, Tig.-Pil. III. 1, 11, *puḫur nišîšu*.

[To be continued in the next number of *HEBRATCA*.]



THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES.

But it would be unjust, however Semitic the character of HEBRAICA may be supposed to be, to stop with this notice of the Syriac version. In the prolegomena

are given translations of the Armenian fragments, from the Venice edition, from a manuscript at Edschmiazin translated by Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, and from Pitra. And while Professor Harris was at work over the Syriac version at Cambridge, Mr. J. Armitage Robinson (editor of these Texts and Studies), while he "was turning over Latin Passionals at Vienna in a fruitless search for a lost manuscript of the Passion of S. Perpetua," happened to recognize "words which recalled the manner and the thought of Aristides" as he was reading portions of the Latin version of the story of Barlaam and Josaphat! That, of course, was a flash-like discovery that the speech of Nachor, in the Greek version of that story, was merely, though indeed, an embodiment, by the Greek redactor and Christianizer of this old Sanskrit story, of the Apology of Aristides into the fable; yet done so neatly, beautifully and masterfully, that the most diligent scrutinizer of the Greek story of Barlaam and Josaphat has never suspected any such embodiment, nor ever thought of anything more than a fresh or original Greek composition. And this, too, notwithstanding the fact that the tracing of the story from Sanskrit into a multitude of languages, and from a heathen fable to a Christian legend, has been taken up as a task by specialists, and the whole thing sifted with a freedom that Pentateuchal critics might envy, till it seemed that its kernel and accretions were most absolutely known and severally distinguished.

Naturally, again, the work of Professor Harris would not be complete without revising his translation in the light of the Greek, and Mr. Robinson's giving a tolerably critical edition of the Greek text in the shape recoverable from the fable of Barlaam and Josaphat, with prolegomena, notes, and a critical discussion of the question how far and wherein the Syriac, the Greek and the Armenian present the original Apology of Aristides. Into the detail of this we cannot go here. It seems plain, however, that the Greek has been compressed or excised somewhat, and equally plain that the Syriac has amplified a little. It is likewise plain that we possess the style, as well as the thought and the substance of the original apology, though it may not be possible to say just where a corner has been knocked off or a piece of stucco supplied.

Messrs. Harris and Robinson have each contributed to the special portion of the other, and beautifully exemplified the proverb that two are better than one, as well as the charm of brothers in concord and unity.

The multitude of minor points discussed and illumined and elucidated in this publication, though of exceeding interest, we must pass by. The University of Cambridge in England, and Haverford College in America, are to be most warmly congratulated upon such a brilliant and interesting work; and none the less so are the authors for the scholarship, acumen and patience everywhere exhibited. (8vo, paper, pp. 118, 28. English price, five shillings).

ISAAC H. HALL,  
New York City.

#### AMIAUD AND SCHEIL'S LES INSCRIPTIONS DE SALMANASAR II.\*

Arthur Amiaud did not live to see this work brought to completion. If he had, this notice would be different in many particulars. Scheil, a student of one year, whom Amiaud associated with him in the work, is responsible for all that

\* LES INSCRIPTIONS DE SALMANASAR II. roi d'assyrie (860-824), transcrites, coordonnées, traduites et commentées par A. Amiaud et V. Scheil. Par's: H. Welter, 1890. Pp. xiv and 120.

is good and bad in this book, and I am forced to say that the good points are few in comparison with the bad.

In the preface, Scheil gives a genealogical table of Shalmaneser, a short history of the different inscriptions of this king, and his reasons for his method of transliteration.\* The connected and accented transliteration is much preferable to the syllabic method, but only in the hands of a person who knows the lexicon and grammar. Scheil does not know either of these and, as a result, his accentuation is very faulty. It would have been much better if he had not attempted to make grammatical forms, for his attempt has been an utter failure. Making all due allowance for very careless proof-reading, there still remain hundreds of words either incorrectly accented or left unaccented. I have counted more than 400 typographical errors on the 120 pages.

In the preface, after noticing the work of his predecessors, Scheil states that the object of this edition of these texts is to bring them to the present status of Assyriological research. Instead of a step forward he has taken two steps backward. His transliterations are based on the printed texts as published in Rawlinson and Layard. In the Monolith Inscription he has made good use of Dr. Craig's emendations as published in his Leipzig dissertation. Why could he not have crossed over to London and collated these texts anew? It is unscientific and useless to put further transliterations and translations upon the market without a thorough collation of the originals. Such must be regarded as only approximately correct, and cannot, in any case, be cited as authoritative. Craig has done much for the Monolith and Throne Inscriptions. Why did not Scheil follow in his steps and fix the texts of these inscriptions for all time, as Lyon has done for some of the Sargon texts? As things stand, another edition of the Shalmaneser texts is needed at once, but an edition based on a thorough revision of the printed texts by a close comparison with the collations of others and a careful study of the originals.

I can notice only a few of his transliterations. We find *apil* and *abil*, and *abil* and *ablu* at the end of proper names, used indiscriminately; *bêlat* and *bêlit*; *tâhazu*, *tahâzu* and *tahazu*; *kibrât* and *kibrat*; *adi* and *adî*; *nîribu* and *nirîbu*; *diktu* and *dîktu*; *pan* and *pân*; *uše-ziz* and *ušêšiz*; *aḥâveš* and *aḥamiš*; *šuzub* and *šûzub*; *râmanu* and *ramânu*; *tanâti* and *tanati*; *ušâlik* and *ušalik*; *ûbla* and *ubla*; *napasi* and *napâsi*; *abiktu* and *apiktu*; *ûmê* and *umê*; *anaku* and *anâku*; *šadû* and *šâdû*; *elî* and *êlî*; *ubân* and *uban*; *šâbê* and *šabê*. I could multiply examples almost indefinitely. A certain writing is often used consistently in the first part of the book—cf. *aḥamiš*, *adî*, etc. There are no rules for accenting verbal forms. At one time it is *iṭîbu* and then *iṭibu*; *inîru* and *iniru*; *ušâlik* and *ušalik*; *ušêziz* and *uše-ziz*; *alik* and *âlik* for *allik* (*al(l)ik*), etc., etc. In some cases the participles are correctly and consistently accented, and in others the accents are just as consistently omitted. The endings *ûtu* and *ânu* are accented or left unaccented at pleasure. The final *i* in the majority of all genitive forms is accented. Scheil has incorporated the 1st per. sg. pronominal suffix into the genitive ending too

\* Nous avons cru devoir continuer la méthode de transcription liée et accentuée. Les voyelles, longues de leur nature, où l'accent est suppléé par deux consonnes qui suivent, le portent ou l'omettent indifféremment, par exemple *dikta*, *dîkta*, *ubla*, *ûbla*, etc.



often, but making allowance for such cases, why should *šinni*—and in the construct state—*tukulti*, *karani*, etc., have their final *i* accented? Little attention is paid to the case endings. Where the scribe has designated a given case, it is well to follow him. In the case of ideograms, one should follow the usage as determined by a thorough study of all the inscriptions. As in his edition of the *Šamši-Rammân* text, so here, no clear distinction is made between 𐎶 and 𐎶, 𐎶, 𐎶 and 𐎶, and 𐎶 and 𐎶. Again such forms as *rîmu* and *rêmu*, *šîru* and *šêru* are not distinguished. The construct state of a noun is seldom indicated, and in the few cases where there is such indication, there is no consistency in usage, e. g., *šulum* and *šulmu šamši*, *šamaš* and *šamšu*, etc. In *Šamši-Rammân* it was *pad*, here it is *pat*; but why not *pât*, the only other possible reading and the one generally accepted? Scheil also reads *bût*, *abil* which is Babylonian for the Assyrian *apil*, *šut*, etc.—But nothing more need be said about the transliteration.

The translation is much better than the transliteration. It is, in fact, a comparatively easy task to make a translation of an historical text. Most of the words are well known and the meanings of those which are difficult can be guessed from the context. It is an altogether different thing to transliterate correctly and to explain philologically these difficult words. Scheil has made good use of the context. The notes are of little value. The author has omitted almost all difficult words and constructions. In the case of doubtful words, which are of very rare occurrence, it is always well to cite all the passages in which these words are found and the literature on the subject. Scheil does neither of these. In many cases he leads one to think that he is not acquainted with the literature. The comments given are often too simple and elementary for beginners even. A list of the geographical terms occurring in the inscription is added and it is of great value. The author promises a special work on the geography in the very near future. No glossary is added, but this is just as well, for the author's attempt in his *Šamši-Rammân* was not a success.

In conclusion, I would say that Scheil has not been successful in his object to present an edition of these inscriptions containing all the results of the latest Assyrian scholarship. The preface announces this as his aim. A study of the book will show any one how poorly he has succeeded.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,  
*London.*

## ◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- ALKER, E. Die Chronologie der Bücher der Könige. *RLCB.*, 1891. 7.
- BABELON, E. La Tradition phrygienne du déluge. *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, Mars-avril, 1891.
- BELON, M. J. L'Histoire de Joseph et le témoignage des monuments. L'Université Catholique. *N. S. T.*, VI., 4. 1891.
- BONK, H. Ueber die Verwendbarkeit der doppelartigen mit יִתְּ und יִן anlautenden Namen im Alten Testament für die historische Quellenkritik. *ZATW.* Heft I. 1891.
- BUDDE, K. Critique of Band 3, Hälfte 2 of Keilschriftliche Bibliothek. *TLZ.*, 1891. No. 9. (May 2.)
- Critique of Kaulen's Assyrian und Babylonian nach der neuesten Entdeckungen. *Ibid.*
- Critique of Jeremias's Izdubar-Nimrod. *TLZ.* *Ibid.*
- CHEYNE, T. K. Brevia: Psalms of Solomon, Isaiah LII. 15, Job v. 21. *Expositor*, May, 1891.
- Critique of Hoffmann's Hiob. *Critical Review*, May, 1891.
- I Kings x. 22. *Expositor*, June, 1891.
- Job v. 7. *ZATW.*, XI. 1. 1891.
- CORNILL, C. H. Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik. *ZATW.* Heft I. 1891.
- CROSS, J. A. The Quotations from the O. T. in the Fourth Gospel. *Classical Review*, 1891, pp. 142-3.
- DALMAN, GUSTAF. Critique of Streane's A Translation of the Treatise Chagigah from the Babylonian Talmud. *TLZ.*, No. 14. 1891.
- DAVIDSON, A. B. Critique of Reuss's Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Des alten Testaments. *Critical Review*, May, 1891.
- ELMSLIE, W. G. Habakkuk. *Expositor*, June, 1891.
- GUTBROD, G. J. F. Ueber die wahrscheinliche Lebensdauer der assyrisch-babylonischen Sprache. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques XXII., Le Psaume IX. *Revue des études juives*, Jan.-Mars, 1891.
- HERDERSCHEE, I. Het slotvers van 2 Sam. XII. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1891, 2, pp. 127-132.
- HOLLENBERG, J. Critique of L. E. Albers' Die Quellenberichte in Josua I.-XII. *TLZ.* 11. 1891.
- HORST, L. Études sur le Deutéronome. *Revue de l'hist des religions*, Mars-avril, 1891.
- HUIZINGA, A. H. Analogy in the Semitic Languages. *American Journal of Philology*, April, 1891.
- KNUDTZON, J. A. Bemerkungen zum ersten Band der "Keilschriftliche Bibliothek." *ZA.*, VI. 1 u 2.
- JASTROW, M., JR. Assyrian Vocabularies. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- JENSEN, P. Vorstudien zur Entzifferung des Mitanni. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- MÜHLMANN, JOH. Zur Frage de Makkabäischen Psalmen. *Progr. d. k. Wilhelmsgymn.* Berlin.
- MULLER, A. Critique of Barth's Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. *TLZ.*, No. 14. 1891.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. Der Pardiesfluss Gihon in Arabien? *ZDMG.*, 44. 4. 1891.
- OPPERT, J. Un texte babylonien astronomique et sa traduction grecque d'après Claude Ptolémée. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- SAYCE, A. H. Isaiah and Phut in the Babylonian Inscriptions. *Academy*, April, 1891.
- SIEGFRIED, C. Critique of Petermann's Pentateuchus Samaritanus V. *TLZ.*, No. 13. 1891.
- SMITH, H. P. The Value of the Vulgate Old Test. for textual criticism. *Pres. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 1891.
- SUGDEN, E. M. Critical note on Ps. 119, 122. *Expositor*, June, 1891.
- SWETE, H. B. A new fragment of the Bodleian Genesis. *Academy*, June, 1891.
- TELONI, B. La questione dei cherubim e dei genii alati degli assiro-caldei. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- WINCKLER, H. Vorarbeiten zu einer Gesamtbearbeitung der el-Amarna texte. *ZA.*, VI., 1 u 2.
- ZIMMERN, H. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprunge des Purimfestes. *ZATW.* Heft I. 1891.



# GENERAL INDEX.

Annexion in Assyrian.....	288
Arabic Version of the Abgar-Legend, An.....	268
Assyrian Etymologies.....	183, 253
Bacon, Rev. Benjamin W., Notes on the Analysis of Gen. xv.....	75
—— The Blessing of Isaac, Gen. xxvii.—A Study in Pentateuchal Analysis.....	143
—— Notes on the Analysis of Gen. xxxii.—L.....	278
Blessing of Isaac, The, Gen. xxvii.—A Study in Pentateuchal Analysis....	143
Book Notices : Sellin, Verbal Nominale Doppelnatur der Hebräischen Parti- cipien und Infinitive, 152 ; The Divine Name Adonaj and its History, 154 ; Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, 156 ; Wright on Compara- tive Semitic Grammar, 232 ; Keilschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vor- lesungen, 233 ; Driver's Samuel, 235 ; Scheil, Šamšî-Rammân IV., 237 ; The Apology of Aristides, 302 ; Amiaud and Scheil's Les Inscriptions de Salmanasar II., 303.	
Breasted, James H., The Order of the Sentence in the Hebrew Portions of Daniel.....	245
Colloquy of Moses on Mount Sinai, The.....	161
Contributed Notes : Azazel (Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26), 77 ; Three Contract Tablets of Ašûritilîlâni, 79.	
Contributions to the History of Geography.....	39
Davis, John D., The Moabite Stone and the Hebrew Records.....	178
Gottheil, Prof. Richard J. H., Contributions to the History of Geography. II. Candelabrum Sanctorum and Liber Radiorum of Gregorius Bar 'Ebhrya.....	39
—— An Arabic Version of the Abgar-Legend.....	268
Green, Prof. W. Henry, The Pentateuchal Question. III. Gen. xxxvii. 2— Ex. xii. 51.....	1, 104
Hall, Isaac H., The Colloquy of Moses on Mount Sinai.....	161
—— Two Nestorian Ritual Prayers.....	241
Hebrew and Rabbinical Words in Present Use.....	72
Jastrow, Morris, Jr., A Phœnician Seal.....	257
Kent, Charles F., Annexion in Assyrian.....	289



Kraetzschmar, Richard, The Sign of the Breath at the End of Words in the New-Babylonian and Achæmenian Inscriptions.....	149
Moabite Stone and the Hebrew Records, The.....	178
Muss-Arnolt, Rev. W., Notes on the Publications contained in Vol. II. of Eberhard Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. I. The Inscriptions of Sennacherib. II. The Inscriptions of Esarhaddon.....	56, 81
—— Assyrian Etymologies.....	183, 253
Notes on the Analysis of Gen. xv.....	75
Notes on the Analysis of Gen. I.-XXXI.....	222
Notes on the Analysis of Gen. XXXII.-L.....	278
Notes on the Publications contained in Vol. II. of Eberhard Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.....	56, 81
Order of the Sentence in the Hebrew Portions of Daniel, The.....	245
Patterson, Gaylard H., The Septuagint Text of Hosea compared with the Massoretic Text.....	190
Phoenician Seal, A.....	257
Pinches, Theo. G., "Sonhood," or Adoption among the Early Babylonians..	186
Pentateuchal Question, The.....	1, 104
Semitic Bibliography.....	80, 159, 237, 306
Septuagint Text of Hosea compared with the Massoretic Text, The.....	190
Sign of the Breath at the End of Words in the New-Babylonian and Achæmenian Inscriptions, The.....	149
"Sonhood," or Adoption among the Early Babylonians.....	168
Sproull, Prof. William O., Hebrew and Rabbinical Words in Present Use...	72
Two Nestorian Ritual Prayers.....	241